

Archives
LH
1
.B56
S61
2004
copy 2

Southern Academic Review



BIRMINGHAM-SOUTHERN COLLEGE



5 0553 01224553 3

LIBRARY
OF
BIRMINGHAM-SOUTHERN
COLLEGE

Southern Academic Review

A Student Journal of Scholarship

Volume Seventy-One

Brandon Lee, Editor-In-Chief
Jessica Wood, Associate Editor
Dr. Matthew A. Levey, Advisor

Archives
LH
1B56
561
2007
C08/2

Southern Academic Review (SAR) is published every spring by students of Birmingham-Southern College. It is funded by the Student Government Association and operates under the supervision of the Student Publications Board. *SAR* seeks to publish material of scholarly interest to the students and faculty of Birmingham-Southern college, and the editorial scope encompasses all disciplines. Fully annotated research papers and shorter essays receive equal consideration for publication. *SAR* accepts submissions from any currently enrolled student or alumnus of the college. No submission will be considered if it has been previously submitted for academic credit at an institution other than Birmingham-Southern. Although most of *SAR's* content consists of student work, submissions from Birmingham-Southern faculty and guest lecturers will also be considered for publication. Manuscripts should be sent to: Editor, *Southern Academic Review*, Box 549046, Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham, Alabama 35254.

Copyright 2004 by *Southern Academic Review*
and Birmingham-Southern College
Printed by EBSCO, Birmingham, Alabama

Contents

The Change In A “Southern” College <i>M. Brent Pritchard</i>	1
A Fatal Pause: Abraham Lincoln and Joseph Hooker <i>Charles Roberts</i>	33
Hardwired to Connect? Biology’s Influence on Civil Society <i>Tim Johnson</i>	45
Displacement, the Loss of Self, and the Reconstruction of a Culturally Specific Identity in Toni Morrison’s <i>Beloved</i> and Leslie Marmon Silko’s <i>Ceremony</i> <i>Aynsley Harrow</i>	55
Black Elk Speaks: Lakota or Legend? <i>Cari Beth Penn</i>	67
Yeats: His Friends and His Questions <i>Ashley Pope</i>	73
Effects of Western Contact on Native Hawaiians <i>Wesley Gannon Kelley</i>	77

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Lyrasis Members and Sloan Foundation

The Change In A “Southern” College

M. Brent Pritchard

Today, Birmingham-Southern College ranks among the best liberal arts colleges in America. Its genteel deportment and commitment to excellence have elevated its stature from being a small, private college to that of an institution that stakes its pride and reputation in providing one of the best educations in the Southeast. Questions of the institution's future no longer mar the reputation of the college, but do unmistakably mark the path of the college's history. These questions lie in the birth, growth, relocation, maturity of, and decisions made by 'Southern. Known to the outside world as "the Hilltop," a name that has characterized the schools performance and position; its pinnacled story lies in the valleys of its past.

Two institutions merged at the end of World War I to become Birmingham-Southern College. Built with the wealth of slavery and agriculture, Southern University arose from the dreams of plantation owners to educate their sons locally. It lived a life plagued by war and a lack of money and ended by consolidation rather than elimination.¹ Like Southern University and present day Birmingham-Southern College, the North Alabama Conference College had been based under the auspices of the Methodist Church. Located at BSC's current site, the college was built at Owenton overlooking both Birmingham and Bessemer. However, as would plague Birmingham-Southern decades later, Birmingham College, renamed from the North Alabama Conference College, faced rumors of relocation and a decreasing enrollment as did Southern University. A decision, which saved both parent institutions by combining them into one school, created Birmingham-Southern College. Throughout its history, 'Southern, an endearing name for Birmingham-Southern, has tirelessly strived to achieve the highest standards in academics, civics, service, and athletics. Over time, its rituals, attitudes, physical campus, students and countless other attributes have changed, but only to enable the college to stand as a testament to the preservation of higher education not only in Alabama, but also in America.

The development of the civil rights of African-Americans shares similar outcomes, but incomparably different courses to Birmingham-Southern. Emancipated and finally freed in 1865, African-Americans suffered a century of struggle to achieve full equality. Through Jim Crow, the KKK, segregation, and years of racial tension, African-Americans have endured hardships and preserved to succeed in their own right.

¹ Robert G. Corley and Samuel N. Stayer, *View from the Hilltop: The First 125 Years of Birmingham-Southern College* (Birmingham: Birmingham Publishing Company, 1981).

Not educating African-Americans for the first 109 years of its existence, Birmingham-Southern College and African-Americans led parallel, but separate lives. A transformational change in the relationship between the institution and this race of people began from the college's inception in 1856 and continues to improve to the present day. In this examination, changes in the campus community resulting primarily from the Civil Rights Movement and integration of the college, the direct threats to the status quo and survival of the college, and the evolution of the attitudes of students, faculty, and staff will concretely show that the development of the civil rights of African-Americans significantly altered the life of Birmingham-Southern College. This assessment of this aspect of the history of the college is unique in that it has never been discussed in any formal length in the history of the college. In the field of history, it serves as an additional element of Birmingham-Southern College scholarship.

I.

Graduates and faculty of the college provide a large amount of information through oral history and interviews that relate Birmingham-Southern College to the developing rights of African-Americans. The primary research for this analysis comes from interviews of Dr. O.C. Weaver, Reverend Bud Precise, Reverend Mike Harper, and Mr. George Jenkins.² These interviews provide the best primary information on Birmingham-Southern College and its relation to the Civil Rights Movement and the situation of Birmingham during the 1960's. Both Precise and Harper's interview show contempt and disappointment for the actions of the college and general humanity during the times. Jenkins, however, provides an unscathed, pleasant view of college life that may have not been truly representative of the times. Dr. Ralph Tanner and Mr. John Evins also provide primary information on the issues of integration and the sale or relocation of the college during the 1970's.² The only weakness of these sources is that it has been thirty to forty years or more since the events that these men could recall have taken place. The Evins interview is possibly skewed due to his opinions regarding the situations of the college during his tenure of service. *The Birmingham News* helps to provide a series of accounts of the history of the college and its relation to the city during the 1960's and 1970's.³ Articles, speeches, and editorials printed in *The Hilltop News* provide the responses of students and faculty during the times when landmark events were taking place and an accurate account of the events of the times.⁴

² Dr. O. C. Weaver, interview by Brent Pritchard, 5 March 2003., Reverend Bud Precise, interview by Brent Pritchard, 8 April 2003., Reverend Mike Harper, interview by Brent Pritchard, 4 April 2003., and George Jenkins, interview by Brent Pritchard, 14 April 2003.

³ *The Birmingham News*.

⁴ *The Hilltop News*.

A small number of secondary sources exist on this topic. Dr. Weaver and Joseph Park's 1957 history of the college, entitled *Birmingham-Southern College 1856-1956*, and Robert Corley and Samuel Stayer's 1981 history, entitled *View from the Hilltop: The First 125 Years*, provide excellent facts and insight into the history of the college.⁵ Corley and Stayer's ignore the problematic and important Civil Rights stage of the college's history. Diane McWhorter's 2001 *Carry Me Home: Birmingham, Alabama: The Climatic Battle of the Civil Rights Revolution* and J. Mill Thornton III's 2002 *Dividing Lines: Municipal Politics and the Struggle for Civil Rights in Montgomery, Birmingham, and Selma* provide further insight into the context of the Civil Rights Movement in regards to Birmingham-Southern College.⁶ Dr. Henry King Stanford's 2000 work, *Campus Under Political Fire and Other Essays*, offers his testimony of the events that occurred during his tenure as president of the college.⁷ Stanford may, however, be biased in his opinions or portrayal of historical evidence. These interviews and printed works convey the historical facts, perceptions, and attitudes of Birmingham-Southern and its students and faculty that are necessary to evaluate the development of civil rights and its effect on the life of the college.

II.

In the early 1850's, the wealthy plantation owners of Alabama's Black Belt realized the need for an academic institution to educate their sons without having to send them to the schools of the East. Additionally, the plantation owners feared if they sent their sons east, that they might be susceptible to abolitionist ideas and practices. With the help of the Methodist Church and wealthy landholders, Southern University incorporated in 1856. Many donors gave the college money and assets in the form of slaves to the college's endowment.⁸ In fact, much of Southern Universities endowment was slave equity.⁹ John A. Reublet, one of the first professors at the University, bought a slave as soon as he arrived in Greensboro.¹⁰ However, some donors, such as Lucius Q.C. DeYampert, were reluctant slaveholders who hoped for emancipation. Classes began in 1859, but only six years after the Civil War began, 1865, the universi-

⁵ Oliver C. Weaver and Joseph H. Parks, *Birmingham-Southern College 1856-1956* (Nashville: The Parthenon Press, 1957), and Corley and Stayer, *View from the Hilltop: The First 125 Years of Birmingham-Southern College*.

⁶ Diane McWhorter, *Carry Me Home: Birmingham, Alabama: The Climatic Battle of the Civil Rights Revolution* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001), and J. Mills Thornton III, *Dividing Lines: Municipal Politics and the Struggle for Civil Rights in Montgomery, Birmingham, and Selma* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2002).

⁷ Dr. Henry King Stanford, *Campus Under Political Fire and Other Essays* (Columbus, GA: X-Press Printing, 2000).

⁸ Corley and Stayer, *View from the Hilltop: The First 125 Years of Birmingham-Southern College*, 7.

⁹ Dr. Guy W. Hubbs, interview by Brent Pritchard, 11 November 2003.

¹⁰ Weaver and Parks, *Birmingham-Southern College 1856-1956*, 49.

ties enrollment reduced to drastically low numbers and its endowment almost dwindled to nonexistence due to the freedom of slaves.¹¹ The founders, however, persevered in their support for the college. Throughout the remainder of the university's days in Greensboro, there was little social interaction between students and newly freed blacks. At times, students would be involved in fights with local blacks at the edge of town, but no real interaction between the races took place.¹²

Southern University moved from Greensboro to Birmingham and consolidated with Birmingham College in 1918 to become Birmingham-Southern College. Again, as with both parent institutions, the college remains segregated at the time of its inception except for a number of custodial or food service positions. One employee, Henry Peck, a black janitor at the college, became a trusted friend to many of the students.¹³ John Kenner, a student, even went so far as to steal a diploma from the president's office, sign Peck's name, and present the honorary diploma to the janitor. Peck's friendship was not a common occurrence between blacks and whites in the early years of the college, but it is one representation of the cordial relationship that did exist between some African-Americans and whites. This relationship is difficult to demonstrate, but did sources do credit it's existence.

In the 1930s, the YMCA and YWCA facilitated religious life programs at the college.¹⁴ For the era, these organizations shared a moderate to liberal view of Christian theology. The director of the college's YMCA, as well as a number of 'Southern students studying religion, began to be influenced by the growing progressive movement of the church leaders in the worldwide church and in the North Alabama Conference of the United Methodist Church. The church leaders preached social justice issues and Christian socialist views, which also began to take shape as classes taught on race relations in the Sociology Department at the college. The views taught by these church leaders and the Sociology Department of the college were very liberal relative to the standards of the times. This is the advent of the transformation that slowly began to take place in 'Southern's life.

A number of Methodist ministers began to be influenced by the teachings they received from both the YMCA and some classes at 'Southern.¹⁵ Andrew Turnipseed, J.B. Nichols, and Dan Witchett graduated from 'Southern with a desire to try to improve the church and the world by implementing this new Christian socialist view. Turnipseed, Nichols, Witchett, and other 'Southern graduates who later became

¹¹ Ibid, 11 November 2003.

¹² Corley and Stayer, *Birmingham-Southern College 1856-1956*, 82.

¹³ Wilbur D. Perry, *A History of Birmingham-Southern College: 1856-1931* (Nashville: The Pantheon Press, 1931), 48.

¹⁴ Weaver, 5 March 2003.

¹⁵ Ibid, 5 March 2003.

Methodist ministers and who were affected by the social justice teachings, attempted to reshape the mind of the Methodist church by preaching their views on social justice. These men did have difficulties in their own churches, but continued to teach their own philosophies to the people of Alabama. The progressive teachings these Methodist ministers received at 'Southern helped prepare them to be among the leaders who would help transform the views on civil rights and equality in the North Alabama and the Alabama/West Florida conferences in the 1950s and 1960s.

As the Methodist Church slowly began to change its view on equality and civil rights in the 1930s and 1940s, a contradictory view began to arise in the Democratic party. Southern Democrats began to disagree with a movement in the party regarding civil rights issues.¹⁶ The controversy began in the 1930s, but erupted in July of 1948. A number of disgruntled Southern Democrats left the Democratic party over talk of adopting a civil rights plank in their 1948 national platform and a civil rights package proposed by President Harry S. Truman.

Democrats from Alabama, Mississippi, and other Southern states met on July 17, 1948 in Birmingham Municipal Auditorium and formed the Dixiecrat party, also known as the State's Rights party.¹⁷ The newly created party represented the widespread views of the South at the time. A number of 'Southern students also began to share the Dixiecrats view. Some students took part in the July 1948 convention by carrying signs of Robert E. Lee and cheering for the former Governor Frank Dixon to become the party's 1948 presidential candidate. No major demonstrations or events took place on the campus of 'Southern, but the ideas of the Dixiecrat party did influence 'Southern students as well as a number of individuals in the south.¹⁸

The party resurfaced in the 1950's as the American States Right Party with a number of the top leaders of the Dixiecrat party.¹⁹ In Alabama, a Birmingham group called the American States' Rights Association shared many of the old Dixiecrat beliefs and promoted the continuation of segregation in downtown Birmingham businesses.²⁰ Birmingham-Southern supporters Frank B. Yielding Jr., and R. Hugh Daniel were members of the Birmingham group. The segregationist views by influential supporters of the college played a role in the continuation of segregation of the college.

¹⁶ All information on the Dixiecrat movement can be found in from Kari A. Frederickson, *The Dixiecrat Revolt and The End of the Solid South, 1932-1968* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 123.

¹⁷ Frederickson, *The Dixiecrat Revolt and The End of the Solid South, 1932-1968*, 119, 122, 130,133, 119.

¹⁸ Weaver, 5 March 2003.

¹⁹ McWhorter, *Carry Me Home: Birmingham, Alabama: The Climatic Battle of the Civil Rights Revolution*, 86.

²⁰ Thornton, *Dividing Lines: Municipal Politics and the Struggle for Civil Rights in Montgomery, Birmingham, and Selma*, 190.

In the 1940s and 1950s, Birmingham lacked a leadership class because decisions controlling the city were made by the steel industries in Pittsburgh.²¹ The city was completely segregated, as was much of the South. Every facet of daily life was segregated, from drinking fountains to movie theatres. Segregation had become an accepted aspect of life for both blacks and whites. Any integration attempt ended by being severely crushed. Segregation still held a controlling grip over race relations at 'Southern. The sole interactions between races at the college were with black workers serving as janitors, cooks, and house cleaners. The segregation and inequality of the South slowly forced African-Americans to take a stand for their own rights. A change also began to mount in the leadership of the college.

In 1942, Dr. George R. Stuart began his tenure as college president, he also played an important political role because his father was the minister of First United Methodist Church in downtown Birmingham.²² Stuart's liberal views of race relations and his progressivism often came into conflict with the board of trustees. Ed Norton, a member of the board of trustees, kept the board from removing Stuart because of his liberal views. In March 1955, Stuart supported a two-day race relations discussion on the college's campus. A sociology professor at the college, Harold Hudson, organized the Race Relations Institute, informally known as the Salt and Pepper Conference.²³ Attendance of the institute was high, but the event drew some sharp criticism to the college. The negative publicity for the college and the board of trustee's constant disapproval of Stuart's views on race that meant Norton could no longer stave off Stuart's dismissal. Birmingham-Southern had lost its first administrator who made efforts to improve race relations in Birmingham and the college.

Two events occurred at relatively the same time as the Race Relations Institute that dramatically changed Birmingham-Southern College. In 1954, the Supreme Court handed down a landmark decision in *Brown vs. Topeka*, which made school segregation illegal

and provided an unprecedented interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment.²⁴ This decision had no immediate effect on the college, but did divide both the anti-segregationists and segregationists and began the movement that became the Civil Rights Movement. The other event occurred in 1956, when the Methodist Church decided to abolish its Central Conference.²⁵ The Central Conference contained all the black Methodist churches in the United States. Abolishment meant that the

²¹ All information on Birmingham can be found in personal interviews of Weaver, 5 March 2003., Precise, 8 April 2003., Harper, 4 April 2003., and Jenkins, 14 April 2003.

²² Weaver, 5 March 2003.

²³ Thornton, *Dividing Lines: Municipal Politics and the Struggle for Civil Rights in Montgomery, Birmingham, and Selma*, 190.

²⁴ Stanford, *Campus Under Political Fire and Other Essays*, 23.

²⁵ *Doctrines and Disciplines of The United Methodist Church 1956* (Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1956), 122.

black churches would become members of the annual conferences where they were located. The North Alabama Conference, however, took measure to change race relations.²⁶ Until 1963, the North Alabama Conference maintained the stance of the Methodist Church, but took no formal stance as an annual conference. In that year, a one-vote majority abolished the central conference of the North Alabama Church. Bishop Kenneth Goodson, who was also a member of the board of trustees, helped to lead the church to desegregating and later served in a similar role in the decision making process to integrate the college.²⁷ The stage was set for the monumental changes. Blacks now had an advantage in their fight for equality as the church began to make internal attempts to reach equality.

At this time, 'Southern remained, in these racial matters, a model of the typical college of the South. The student body primarily focused on academics and social life.²⁸ A change did begin to develop in that the college did begin to be more opened minded about race issues. However, no form of activism for civil rights existed at the college at this time. The racial slurs of the day were not acceptable vernacular among the student body. The unspoken rule about racial slurs contrasts the silence from the nonexistence of discussions of civil rights issues at the college. A number of these issues were discussed in sociology and religion classes, but were rarely directed by any faculty of the college. Precise felt that the school gave no encouragement to the student body to leave campus and become involved in the life of the city.²⁹ The inconsistencies of the student body were representative of the society at that time.

Students did begin to take part in biracial events.³⁰ Price Fellowship, an early morning prayer group based at 'Southern, tutored black students at a community center on Eighth Avenue downtown, near Parker High School. Several 'Southern students also took part in an integrated breakfast group that met at the A.G. Gaston Motel in downtown Birmingham about twice a month. David Vann, a civil rights lawyer and future mayor of Birmingham, often met with this group. Precise took place in the discussions at the A.G. Gaston Motel, but felt that there were never any results from the meetings. He did feel, however, it was an important step towards biracial cooperation. These examples were not typical actions of students, but were not uncommon among the student

²⁶ Calvin M. Pinkard, et al., *Journal of The North Alabama Conference of The Methodist Church Twenty-Fifth Session* (Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1963), 148.

²⁷ Buttram, Mac. Interview by Brent Pritchard, 10 November 2003. Buttram, who is a Methodist minister, notes that his uncle, Reverend Bert Goodwin, cast the deciding vote to abolish the central conference. Goodwin, who was the executive director of Camp Sumatanga, the Methodist camp of north Alabama, had to return to his duties at the camp. Bishop Goodson allowed him to cast his ballot early and he left before the decision was announced. Goodwin's vote was counted last and, theoretically; he cast the deciding vote.

²⁸ Precise, 8 April 2003.

²⁹ Precise, 8 April 2003.

³⁰ Ibid., 8 April 2003.

body. The student participation is the first example of the transformation of student opinion of the African-American race and their place within society.

In 1960, another event took place on campus that signaled the beginning of a shift in student opinions on race relations issues. Ninety-seven BSC students, mainly female students, sent a petition to Alabama governor John Patterson in response to his order to dismiss black protestors at Alabama State University.³¹ The students signed the petition because they believed it violated the protestors' right to academic freedom, not necessarily for the civil rights of the protestors. Two days after the letter had been sent to the governor, *The New York Times* printed the letter and two Birmingham newspapers published the papers without the signatures.³² This event created more negative publicity for the school that was currently undertaking a major fundraising drive.

Dr. Henry King Stanford, who assumed the presidency of the college in 1957, would prove to be more progressive than his predecessor, President Stuart.³³ Stanford, an academic, traveled the world before arriving on the Hilltop. He immediately became engaged in fundraising drives that took him away from the college for extended periods. Although busy in fundraising, Stanford additionally took an active role in the politics and life of the city. Stanford became a member of the Alabama Council on Human Rights, a civil rights advocacy group, and helped present a petition to the Birmingham City Council against its closing of city parks. His leadership and devotion to justice set an example that began to obligate the students of 'Southern to the ensuing events that led to the Civil Rights Movement.

Stanford attempted to preserve the student's ability to exercise their academic freedom of expression. Events such as the Reeves affair and the Patterson petition transpired during Stanford's tenure. In an unspoken policy, Stanford did not support students who took part in demonstrations, but he was lenient and understanding of their actions. This unspoken policy coupled with Stanford's support of academic freedom and his own actions drew him into conflict with Bull Connor, City Hall, and even the college's board of trustees. A new sense of urgency of the growing racial problems in Birmingham began to grow among the trustees of the college.

One student action would bring the college and Bull Connor's Birmingham face to face. Thomas Reeves, a twenty-one year old Phi Beta

³¹ Corley and Stayer, *View from the Hilltop: The First 125 Years of Birmingham-Southern College*, 89.

³² Stanford, *Campus Under Political Fire and Other Essays*, 33.

³³ All information on Stanford can be found in *Ibid*, *View from the Hilltop: The First 125 Years of Birmingham-Southern College*, McWhorter, *Carry Me Home: Birmingham, Alabama: The Climatic Battle of the Civil Rights Revolution*, 172,252,257,258,272., *Ibid*, 8 April 2003., *Ibid*, *Campus Under Political Fire and Other Essays*, 2,3,35., Weaver, 5 March 2003., and White, , *A Walk to Freedom: The Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth and The Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights, 1956-1964*, 33.

Kappa ministerial student, became involved in the events of the Birmingham sit-ins.³⁴ Reeves had not participated in the sit-ins, but did visit a friend, Jess Walker at Miles College, where the police spotted him and encircled the building he visited. Reeves left Miles without incident, but on April 2, 1960 in front of the church where he was currently serving, police arrested him on a vagrancy charge. Bull Connor changed the charge against Reeves to intimidating a witness. Despite his action, the college did not dismiss Reeves. Reeves' father wanted him to withdraw from 'Southern for his own safety, but President Stanford argued that Reeves would be safe if he stayed on campus. Dr. Stanford also believed that if Reeves left the college then it would appear that segregationists had forced him to expel Reeves. Stanford had no recommendation other than to place Reeves on academic probation.³⁵ The executive committee of the college became outraged when they learned that Reeves had not been expelled. Stanford, however, took no stance on the Reeves incident or any other students who took part in similar events. Precise, Reeves, and the other students example demonstrate, that students were beginning to involve themselves in biracial situations and slowly realizing the inequality that existed in society. Students were, however, still very inept and largely unaware of the events that were transpiring. The accepted status quo of segregation that students had known all of their lives still existed and was practiced in their daily lives.³⁶

On April 8, 1960, only six days after the Tommy Reeves incident, a cross was burned in the front yard of the president's home. When Stanford informed the police, they disregarded the event as a fraternity prank and told the president not to be alarmed. The college became more apprehensive after the cross burning and Stanford, through Dean Abernethy, issued a pronouncement that students could not take a position on civil rights other than that of a legal standpoint as a member of the Birmingham-Southern College Community.³⁷ Stanford now became concerned for the safety of the students of 'Southern and feared that the KKK might terrorize students on campus. With this student policy in place, tensions began to relax and the rest of Stanford's tenure remained reasonably uneventful.

During Stanford's tenure, the press became involved in portraying Birmingham-Southern College and race relations. In 1959, David Boroff

³⁴ All information on Thomas Reeves can be found in McWhorter, *Carry Me Home: Birmingham, Alabama: The Climatic Battle of the Civil Rights Revolution*, 131, 151, 172., Corley and Stayer, *View from the Hilltop: The First 125 Years of Birmingham-Southern College*, 88, *Ibid*, *Campus Under Political Fire and Other Essays*, 2, 5, 32, 35., Marjorie White, *A Walk to Freedom: The Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth and The Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights, 1956-1964* (Birmingham: Birmingham Historical Society, 1998), 33., and Wesley K. Wicker, *Of Time and Place: The Presidential Odyssey of Dr. Henry King Stanford* (Athens: GA, 1990), 16.

³⁵ *Birmingham-Southern College Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees Minutes*, 8 April, 1960.

³⁶ Precise, 8 April 2003.

³⁷ "Hilltop News Reprints Dean Abernethy's Speech," *The Hilltop News*, 3 May 1963, 4.

wrote an article entitled "The Genteel Tradition on a Southern Campus" that appeared in *Harper's* magazine.³⁸ Boroff describes 'Southern as a school with a mixture of dedication to academics and southern tradition with an attraction of the lifestyle to the north. The only problem the school has, writes Boroff, is its inevitable future with race relations. He found that students and faculty were hesitant to talk about the issue. Nevertheless, Boroff's prediction would come to light within the next year.

In April 1960, another article would again tarnish 'Southern's name. Harrison Sailsbury wrote an article that appeared on the front of the April 12, 1960, *New York Times*, only four days after the cross burning and ten days after Reeves' arrest.³⁹ The article noted the Patterson petition, the Reeves incident, and this event created further negative publicity for the college.⁴⁰ Before the article, Sailsbury had been selected to speak at the college's lecture series on April 19. After reading the article, Bull Connor was enraged over the article's content and issued an arrest warrant for Sailsbury if he entered Birmingham. Sailsbury, due to Connor's threat, was unable to speak at the college. Both the national press that 'Southern received over 1959-1960 and the failure to integrate contributed to the minimal progress made in the school's fundraising drives and the school's failure to receive a Ford Foundation Grant that President Stanford had attempted to gain for the college.

The area around the college also began to change during the Stanford years. At that time, no fence surrounded the campus and anyone could enter the campus grounds.⁴¹ Students still regularly visited downtown via Eighth Avenue and McCoy Methodist Church still thrived as a part of the College Hills Community. In the late 1950s, black families started to move into the neighborhood and white families began to leave.⁴² The College Hills neighborhood would remain predominantly white until the mid 1960s. Many faculty members did not want to make a "white flight" from the neighborhood.⁴³ The Methodist ministers, who were members of the board of trustees, also felt that abandoning the community was the wrong idea. Their sentiments, however, were largely unvoiced and for the first time other trustees started to question the future of the 'Hilltop's campus. Quietly, due to the situation of College Hills and the city, the idea to move the college began to creep into the minds of some trustees. 'Southern truly started to become a racial and an educational enclave in the College Hills neighborhood.⁴⁴

³⁸ Corley and Stayer, *View from the Hilltop: The First 125 Years of Birmingham-Southern College*, 84,85,86., and Wicker, *Of Time and Place: The Presidential Odyssey of Dr. Henry King Stanford*, 68.

³⁹ Stanford, *Campus Under Political Fire and Other Essays*, 38.

⁴⁰ Weaver, 5 March 2003.

⁴¹ Jenkins, 14 April 2003.

⁴² Precise, 8 April 2003.

⁴³ Tanner, 6 November 2003.

⁴⁴ Harper, 4 April 2003.

A change also began to transpire in the faculty of the college in the early 1960s. Several members of the college faculty publicly questioned the stance that the city of Birmingham had taken on segregation.⁴⁵ Many faculty members were committed to broad based civil liberties, but none took any lead or action on civil rights issues.⁴⁶ Professors would challenge students on their own thoughts and perceptions. This began to make students question their own beliefs and accepted practices of life. The questioning of these accepted values exhibit the changes within the faculty of the college from the staunch opinions to a more open, liberal views.

The first signs of enrollment dropping at the college began to result in the 1960's. Events such as Bull Connor's harsh actions and Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "Letters from the Birmingham City Jail," gave the city, along with the college, a negative connotation. Although never seriously proposed, Stanford even thought of changing the name of the college to avoid the negative stigma Birmingham had received and to help aide enrollment.⁴⁷ The name of the college did have some adverse affect on the recruitment, but it was felt by many that the city's name should retain the college's title. The college also faced enrollment problems from the college lacking a central entrance, safety issues due to the lack of a fence, and the growing decline of the College Hills neighborhood.⁴⁸ Issues such as those by Connor and King set the tone of the outside perception of the city for years to come, which would continually hinder 'Southern's attempts to recruit students.

For known reasons, like the Reeves and Ogeltree incidents and the deterioration of College Hills, and for other unknown reasons, contributions to the college also began to decline during this point in the college's history. The degree to which student participation in the civil rights movement affected giving to the college is debatable, but some level of harm did result from these events.⁴⁹ Dr. Tanner comments that "more smoke than fire" resulted from the issue. He notes that those who wished for students participating in questionable activities of the Civil Rights Movement to stop their activities due to the affect it might have on donations to the college. Evins contests that amounts of money that went into the relocation and rejuvenation of Howard College, now Samford University, had originally been intended for 'Southern. These donors were not pleased with changes that were occurring at the college.

Birmingham-Southern was never able to gain the support of the Methodist Church the way Samford was able to from the Baptist Church.

⁴⁵ Wicker, *Of Time and Place: The Presidential Odyssey of Dr. Henry King Stanford*, 20.

⁴⁶ Weaver, 5 March 2003.

⁴⁷ Tanner, 6 November 2003.

⁴⁸ *Ibid*, 6, November 2003.

⁴⁹ Information on the issue of donations to the college during the 1960 and 1970's is provided from personal interviews with *Ibid*, 6 November 2003., and Evins, 17 October 2003. Dr. Tanner graduated, served as a professor, and later as college president of Birmingham-Southern. Mr. John Evins has served on the board of trustees since the mid 1960's. Mr. Evins is 92 years old.

The Methodist Church never gave substantial amounts of money to the college. However, individual Methodists did give large sums of money as donations. A number of faculty wished to stop receiving Methodist aide because some felt it gave the church the right to interfere with the affairs of the college. Stanford often remained in favor of the progressive nature of the Church's stance on wishing for BSC to become more open.⁵⁰ In contrast, the Board of Trustees would stand, at times, in opposition of the church. This led to an eventual change in the power structure of the board of trustees. The trustees reduced the tenure of service of Methodist ministers and enacted a rotation system of ministers. Evins concludes that this allowed the college to bring in additional non-Methodist funds it had not received before. This decline in donations and weakening of the ties with the Methodist Church became an additional factor in the problems that began to plague 'Southern.

The Hilltop also received direct criticism from its cross-town rival, Samford University's, newfound prestige in Birmingham.⁵¹ Howard College, the name of Samford at its East Lake Campus, and 'Southern share a bitter history. The two schools competitively battled in athletics, primarily football, resulting in a student's death and the end of BSC's football program. The relocation in 1957 created a big impression on the city and state. The situation of Birmingham and BSC student's activity in the Civil Rights Movement, regardless of the degree of involvement, also gave Samford the upper hand. Comments later came from Samford that Southern had become a hotbed of socialism and active attempts were made to give 'Southern a bad name. A sense of "one-upmanship" began to appear between BSC and SU. The fortune and mudslinging of Samford left 'Southern scrambling to actively compete for students and donations.

With the end of Dr. Stanford's tenure, a new tension existed between the city and the college. Stanford stood in direct confrontation between academic tradition and the popular sentiments of the community. Stanford did not allow the college to "waiver from its traditional and historical position of academic integrity and freedom in the face of pressures from conformity to strong local feelings."⁵² Stanford's stance produced an almost open hostility between Birmingham-Southern and Bull Connor's Birmingham. This stance by Stanford placed 'Southern in the public eye and divided sentiment within the college.⁵³ Dr. Stanford quietly wished for students not to directly act in the events of the Civil Rights Movement; he did want them to have the opportunity to exercise their academic rights and freedoms. Stanford, however, knew the dangers that surrounded integration discussions. He did prevent an institute on Birmingham's future from taking place on campus due to the issue of

⁵⁰ Harper, 9 November 2003., Tanner, 6 November 2003., Evins, 17 October 2003.

⁵¹ Tanner, 2 November, 2003.

⁵² "Tensions in the Community," *The Birmingham News*, 5 July, 1966.

⁵³ Evins, 17 October 2003.

integration arising.⁵⁴ Stanford's stances, at times, injured the colleges view by many people in the city.

Regardless of Stanford's attempts to ensure student's academic freedom, few actively participated in the demonstrations, lunch counter sit-ins, and boycotts that took place in Birmingham. This was mainly due to the policy on student activism of President Howard Phillips, who became president of the college after Stanford resigned in 1962. What was a somewhat unspoken rule under Stanford now became policy under Phillips. If a student were to participate in demonstrations, the student body needed to disassociate themselves with Birmingham-Southern College.⁵⁵ This policy under Phillips caused many students to take no stance on the issues that were occurring in downtown Birmingham. Due to fear of student protests and other problems face by the college at this time, this policy was enacted to provide protection for the future of the college.⁵⁶ Phillips and other administrators attempted to carry out their duties to the best of their abilities during the traumatic days of the civil rights movement.

Ignoring the college's policy, some students did actively participate in the demonstrations. In 1963, Birmingham-Southern students, along with students from Miles College, Daniel Payne College, and Booker T. Washington College, participated in a selective buying campaign against downtown Birmingham businesses.⁵⁷ However, only a minority of students participated in these events. One student, Martha Turnipseed, daughter of Andrew Turnipseed, believed that she needed to participate in the Civil Rights Movement and defied the college by marching in a Martin Luther King rally on April 23, 1964, and by taking part in a lunch counter sit-in on April 24.⁵⁸ An unknown person spotted Turnipseed and reported her actions to the college. Once Turnipseed became aware that the college administration knew of her involvement, she voluntarily withdrew from the college rather than face expulsion.⁵⁹ Turnipseed later returned her senior year, after a stint at Millsaps college, to complete her education at 'Southern.

After the Turnipseed incident, a number of students, faculty, and staff became confused and angered by the actions of the college. BSC students Noel Koestline and Barbara McBride received a year of social probation for their association with Turnipseed, even though they had not participated in the sit-ins. Koestline believes the punishment had been handed down to attempt to create the impression that Turnipseed,

⁵⁴ *Birmingham-Southern College Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees*, 18 August, 1961.

⁵⁵ Phillips speech

⁵⁶ Harper, 4 April 2003.

⁵⁷ White, *A Walk to Freedom: The Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth and The Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights, 1956-1964*, 38.

⁵⁸ Noel Koestline, interview by Jessica Missions, 22 April 1997.

⁵⁹ Weaver, 5 March 2003.

McBride, and Koestline were trying to damage the reputation of the college.⁶⁰ William and Trudy Meyer, who were French and Chemistry professors respectively, at the college, wrote a letter to *The Hilltop News* that encouraged students not to leave campus and involve themselves in the demonstrations, but to remain on campus and begin discussions about the issues of the Civil Rights Movement in hopes that it would foster a change in the policy of the school.⁶¹

Most students had limited awareness and almost no involvement of the demonstrations occurring only miles from the college.⁶² A handful of students traveled downtown at times to gain a firsthand view of the events taking place. These students would return to campus and tell others about the events. The television and newspaper reports often failed accurately to portray the events occurring in Birmingham. The events of the year 1963 and 'Southern student's reactions are actively portrayed in the 1964 *Southern Accent*. In its introduction, it mentions that the Civil Rights Movement was such "little noise and pain for such a great battle."⁶³ The introduction spoke of "how during Birmingham's slow crucifixion, you went to class and took tests and sat in the cafeteria drinking your iced tea," while at the same time "old pine shacks were burning in the black ghetto." This brief statement briefly awakens students that, while they continue to be isolated and remain focused on college life, a more important event was taking place within miles of their own 'Hilltop.

The college remained slow to transform as the Civil Rights Movement reached its zenith. The events occurring did not concern the students, not because of apathy, but because the events were not prevalent to the reasons why students were at 'Southern.⁶⁴ All were brought up to recognize the segregation of races and to allow segregation to continue because it was the accepted status quo for their entire lives. One of the most infamous events in the Civil Rights Movement, the Sixteenth Street Church bombing, changed the thoughts and feelings of many 'Southern students.

Twenty race related bombings took place before one, on September 15, 1963, stirred the emotions of the students of Birmingham-Southern College. After the bombing that took the lives of four little girls on a Sunday morning, students truly began to realize the occurrences taking place outside of Birmingham-Southern.⁶⁵ People slowly began to realize that blacks were serious about their need for equality and that the status quo that all whites had experienced their entire life was changing. Students still did not comprehend the seriousness of the bombing or the other events that were taking place, but it was a definite turning point in

60 Bennett., 22 April 1997.

61 William and Trudy Meyer, Letter, *The Hilltop News*, 3 May 1963, 4.

62 Jenkins, 14 April 2003.

63 *Southern Accent*. Vol. 23. Birmingham: Birmingham-Southern College Press, 2-3.

64 Jenkins, 14 April 2003.

65 Ibid, 14 April 2003.

their thoughts. A realization of the events taking place finally took hold in the isolated academia that Birmingham-Southern had been its entire history. Students began to vocalize their opinions and the SGA even passed a resolution condemning the violence that was occurring in Birmingham.

Although students slowly began to realize the social change occurring, they did little to involve themselves in biracial situations.⁶⁶ Students began to stop shopping at downtown business amid fear of demonstrations and violence. A number of students, however, continued to feel perplexed by the stance the college had taken regarding the civil rights issue. While the mission of the college encouraged students to educate themselves from a variety of experiences, both in and out of the classroom, the college continued to prohibit students from learning from the contemporary experiences of the time.⁶⁷ As time progressed, the Civil Rights Movement began to be discussed in a number of situations at 'Southern. A group of students did begin a bi-racial Bible study and the college chaplain, Tom Ogeltree, who later founded Vestavia Hills United Methodist Church and served as a professor in the Department of Religion at the college, discussed civil rights issues with students, such as Turnipseed.⁶⁸ At the same time, the administration began to discuss integrating the college.

Beginning with the Stanford administration, integration of the college began to gain support. In 1961, Dr. Stanford had prepared Reverend Otis Kirby to propose a change in the college's admission policy to the board of trustees.⁶⁹ Kirby's motion was not seconded in the board of trustees meeting due primarily to the attack on the Freedom Riders that occurred only two days before the proposal. Paul Clem, a member of the board of trustees and pastor of McCoy Methodist Church, made an additional attempt at integration but, like Kirby's motion, it failed to gain a second. The attempts faltered, but the intent to integrate the college did not. Due to a general uneasiness about integration, the college's trustees would maintain segregation at the college for another four years. Even with a proposal to integrate the college, 'Southern begins to exhibit a changing mindset of the leadership of the college.

During this time, tensions over integration at other schools in the South began to boil over. Large schools, such as the University of Georgia, the University of Mississippi, Louisiana State University, and Tulane all faced difficulty peacefully integrating.⁷⁰ In 1963, just fifty miles southwest of campus, one of the most infamous stands against desegregation took

⁶⁶ Ibid, 14 April 2003.

⁶⁷ Bill Mathews, "Students, 'Southern, and Civil Rights," *The Hilltop News* 1 May 1964.

⁶⁸ Weaver, 5 March 2003, and *The Birmingham-Southern College Board of Trustee Minutes* (Birmingham, 1962), 2.

⁶⁹ Wicker, *Of Time and Place: The Presidential Odyssey of Dr. Henry King Stanford*, 70, 74.

⁷⁰ All information on integration of southern schools is found in E. Culpepper Clark, *The Schoolhouse Door* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 157.

place at Alabama's flagship institution, the University of Alabama. Governor George C. Wallace first attempted to block integration in the courts arguing against segregation because it was a "state's rights" issue. After his efforts in the courts failed, he decided to make his infamous stand in the schoolhouse door made his infamous stand in the schoolhouse door to block the entrance of James Hood and Vivian Malone to attend the university. Appeals came from Robert F. Kennedy, the U.S. Attorney General. Wallace finally accepted segregation's fate and stepped back from the issue. Auburn University would follow suit and peacefully integrate in 1964.⁷¹ Integration now had been achieved at Alabama's largest university; it still, however, had to be achieved at Alabama's smaller institutions.

Becoming the first higher educational institution in Alabama to integrate, Spring Hill College integrated simultaneously with the Brown vs. Board decision in 1954. The Catholics had discussed desegregation as early as the late 1940's, but hesitated due to their feelings that society at large was not ready for integration. The progressive decision received little or no opposition. Nine years later, in his "Letters from the Birmingham City Jail," Martin Luther King, Jr. would speak of Spring Hill's landmark move to desegregate in the heart of Dixie. Spring Hill's example served to be a unique situation of small colleges and universities. Regional school's relative to 'Southern's size, Washington & Lee to Milsaps, faced difficulties in attempts to segregate in the early 1960's. Alabama schools Samford, Huntingdon, and Athens State College, along with BSC, remained segregated.

Birmingham-Southern slowly began to recognize the need for a peaceful integration. At this time, the daughter of a prominent musician applied for admittance to the college.⁷² The school decided to admit the student.⁷³ The student, however, decided against attending Birmingham-Southern College. In 1963, a climactic year in the Civil Rights Movement, many Birmingham-Southern students were not in favor to integrating the college. Almost all students at 'Southern had come from a segregated background and were apprehensive about admitting black students. The college "was as ready as any other school" to desegregate as John Evins states, but the decision still had to be enacted by the college's board of trustees.⁷⁴

Dr. Ralph Tanner recalls that integration caused "hardly a whisper on campus."⁷⁵ The decision to integrate, however, was marked by a series

⁷¹ Weaver, 5 March 2003.

⁷² No information can be found on this, but several sources have mentioned that the administration might not have known that this student was African-American. When the student arrived, the school realized she was African-American and she withdrew, not wishing to be the first African-American to attend.

⁷³ Evins, 17 October 2003.

⁷⁴ Tanner, 2 November 2003.

⁷⁵ All notes on the Board of Trustees involvement in integration can be found in *Birmingham-Southern College Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees*, 18 August, 1961.

of questions by board members regarding the difficult issue. The primary reason that the college desegregated in 1965 resulted from, as Tanner quotes, "It was the right thing to do."⁷⁶ The first question dealt with the financial burdens the college may have possibly faced if it did not choose to integrate. Schools that were not desegregating were at risk of losing federal monies. One trustee felt that 'Southern couldn't continue without the necessary funds from the government. The ability to receive the Ford Foundation Grant of nearly two million dollars, which 'Southern actively competed for in 1965, could also be hindered if the school did not desegregate.

Another issue, African-American student qualification, also arose in these discussions. Emory University had previously integrated and admitted ten students. Of those ten, only eight met the requirement standards. Paul Clem begged the question that if the first set admitted were not qualified would 'Southern's admissions requirements be viewed as discrimination. President Phillips agreed that it might be difficult to locate African-American students who met the criteria, but that integration must occur. At the same time, some trustees began to question degree of compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that must occur. Some asked if the school's compliance meant additionally desegregating the faculty. Others still questioned compliance. Dr. Phillips noted that compliance would have been the "affirmation that in the future that all American citizens who applied and met qualifications would be accepted."

A majority of trustees, regardless of personal sentiments on the issue, now felt that since the Civil Rights Act had been passed, they should vote for integration of the college. Elton B. Stephens agreed with compliance and quoted, "let nature take its course." On that cold day in January of 1965, fifteen board members voted in favor of full compliance and integration of the college that had been founded by slaveholders. Two voted against the motion. The college had made its decisions to integrate peacefully, but now it needed its first black student.

In 1965, Ulysses "Skip" Bennett, a transfer from Morehouse College, became the first African-American student to enroll at Birmingham-Southern College.⁷⁷ Bennett, a commuter student, faced little opposition to his enrollment at the college. He comments two months before his graduation, "I was more or less curious about how I would be received, but I wasn't afraid."⁷⁸ Tanner even characterizes him as a "protégé A. G. Gaston, the influential African-American business leader of the latter half of the twentieth century."⁷⁹ Bennett is recalled as an outgoing, accom-

⁷⁶ All information on the decision to integration can be found in *Birmingham-Southern Board of Trustee Minutes*, 15 January, 1965, *Birmingham-Southern College Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees*, 8 January, 1965, 28 September, 1965, Tanner, 10 November 2003, and Evins, 17 October 2003.

⁷⁷ Ulysses Bennett, interview by Jessica Missios, 22 April 1997.

⁷⁸ "Mood on the Campus: Negro grad optimistic," *The Birmingham News*, 2 April, 1967, 6.

⁷⁹ Tanner, 2 November 2003.

plished student who made an easy transition to Birmingham-Southern College.⁸⁰ Graduating with a degree in business in 1967, Bennett later received an MBA from Stanford University. By the time of Bennett's admittance to the college, the focus of many students shifted away from the Civil Rights Movement to the mounting turmoil in Vietnam. Bennett's arrival came at a time when the Civil Rights Movement began to pass and student sentiment at 'Southern became more adept to African-Americans and the need for equality in society.

The few years immediately following integration were marked with success amid new issues on campus. The college received the Ford Foundation grant in 1966 and began plans for expanding the college. Construction on the college theatre began at this time and the college, as well as the city, began to quiet down from the uproar that marked the Civil Rights Movement and the clamor of the beginning of the 1960's.⁸¹ Students continued to exercise their academic freedom, but rather than focus on domestic issues; they focused on the conflict in Vietnam.⁸² The late 1960's and early 1970's were marked by a relative calm before the stormy and questionable days that lay ahead for the 'Hilltop.

By this point, "White Flight" had almost but all occurred, and homes in the neighborhood became rental properties, which lowered the property value around the school.⁸³ College Hills continued to slip into further decline. These reverberations began to resonate in the board meetings in Munger Hall. Trustees began to become apprehensive about the College Hills neighborhood, fear began to slowly mount for 'Southern's coed population, and enrollment decreased at a steady rate. The college's financial woes became so evident that questions began to be asked about the future of the college.⁸⁴ These fears or some other unknown reasons, led to the discussion of relocating the campus or selling the Owenton site.

An option presented to the college was relocating Birmingham-Southern at a different site in the Birmingham area. In the beginning phases of these discussions, students, faculty, and staff liked the idea of moving the college.⁸⁵ The Board of Trustees had the evident reminder of Samford's good fortune after their move and sought to capitalize on the possibility of their own prosperous situation. Samford garnered much attention from the social and business leadership of Birmingham after its move. One major location site began to be discussed in detail, north Shelby County. Shelby County is located southeast of Jefferson County, which is where the city of Birmingham is located.

⁸⁰ Jenkins, 15 April 2003.

⁸¹ Corley and Stayer, *View from the Hilltop: The First 125 Years of Birmingham-Southern College*, 95.

⁸² Hubbs, 11 November 2003.

⁸³ Ibid, 11 November 2003.

⁸⁴ Karl Setz, "BSC is not planning to join the ranks of the dying-Dean Tanner," *The Birmingham News*, 9 December 1970.

⁸⁵ Tanner, 11 November 2003.

Trustee Hugh Daniel wished to develop a new city in north Shelby County based on the first planned community in the 1960's in the United States, Roston, VA.⁸⁶ Daniel donated a tract of land, about forty acres, in north Shelby county to the college as a gift. Evins remarks that the land was not given as a contingent gift to the college, but simply an offering of goodwill to the college.⁸⁷ The land, Evins said, had no relation with the issue of relocating the college. Several members of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees were the principal supporters of the relocation of the college. The idea became popular among the administration, faculty, and staff. As the college continued to explore its options of relocation, the school began a major fundraising campaign to construct a new college library.⁸⁸ This simultaneous event, with the discussions of the relocation of the college, hindered some trustee's ideas to move the college. In time, Hugh Daniel's plans for a planned community in north Shelby County failed, he, in turn, donated a substantial sum of money to the improvement of the original site of the college.

The proposal of moving the college into downtown Birmingham also fostered discussion in the early 1970's. Several Birmingham-Southern board members were shareholders in the Morris Avenue Corporation, which donated the Bank for Savings building in 1973 to the college.⁸⁹ The building had been given to the college, but as a donation, it served as a tax shelter for the Morris Avenue Corporation. Dr. Tanner states that relocating the college downtown was never an option and that it was never on the college's agenda.⁹⁰ This move downtown was, however, a rumor among some. Tanner states that the press, more than anyone, raised the discussion of moving the campus to downtown Birmingham. Possible plans to begin adult study classes or non-traditional classes, such as those for business professionals that wished to attend school at night, were discussed. The building itself contained asbestos and required maintenance work.⁹¹ The college eventually sold the building and today it houses office space. The relocation of the college, however, did not serve as the greatest challenge to the existence of the college.

In the spring of 1972, fear from some board members of the negative connotation that Birmingham had received in the 1960's, the African-American community that now surrounded the college, falling enrollment, and the decreased giving to the college led to the initiation of discussions on the possibility of selling the college.⁹² In April of 1973, pri-

⁸⁶ Tanner, 11 November 2003.

⁸⁷ Evins, 17 October 2003. John Evins and Hugh Daniel were good friends and Daniel's land gift to the college may have been related to relocating the college to north Shelby County ., Ibid 10 November 2003,

⁸⁸ Tanner, 10 November 2003., and Evins, 17 October 2003.

⁸⁹ Irving Beiman, "B-SC Takes Over Skyscraper," *The Birmingham News*, 16 December 1973, 2.

⁹⁰ Tanner, 11 November 2003.

⁹¹ Daniel Graves, interview by Brent Pritchard, 12 November 2003.

⁹² Ibid, 10 November 2003.

mary contact with Miles College resulted in favorable prospects for their purchase of the college.⁹³ Hugh Daniel gave one million in bearer bonds, five hundred thousand in bonds of South Central Bell and five hundred thousand in U.S. steel, to Dr. Tanner for the relocation of the college. Dr. Tanner, who kept the bearer bonds in his pockets for about three hours just to see "how they would feel," agreed with others that were in favor of a move if it could be conducted quickly and affectively.⁹⁴ May of 1973 brought the schools face to face to broker a deal. In August of that year, 'Southern offered the college for fourteen million dollars to Miles. An original contract and time period had been outlined for Miles to gather the funds needed to complete the purchase and assume the mortgages that the school currently held. The trustees also entertained the idea of proposing the sale of the college to other institutions. However, any formal discussions between any other schools than Miles have not been recorded.

'Southern attempted to aide Miles by offering assistance in fundraising efforts in the outside community. In the process of negotiations, primarily conducted by Dr. Tanner, the college would have accepted an amount as low as nine million dollars to sell the college. Tanner and Miles both knew that even the nine million dollar price tag was far beyond the reach of Miles. 'Southern, however, continued to give Miles numerous opportunities to collect the needed funds. The time on Miles' first contract expired in 1974. Miles filed for extensions and 'Southern graciously allowed them more time to collect the needed funds. At the same time, however, Tanner and the school wished to have the issue resolved by June of 1974 for the annual meeting of the North Alabama Conference of the United Methodist Church. The inability of Miles' to collect the needed funds began to create a feeling of resentment against the sale or move of the college.

As early as late April and early May of 1974, Tanner made recommendations to halt discussions with Miles and plans for relocation.⁹⁵ Birmingham-Southern also began to face the additional task of raising funds for a new campus, if it chose to continue to exist as an institution of higher education.⁹⁶ The fate of Birmingham-Southern College, in these bleak days, was often marked with uncertainty and at times a sense of fear for the death of the Hilltop. In late 1973-74, faculty attitudes turned and began to propose a halt to the plans to sell the college and instead begin improvements and construct the proposed new library on the college's current site.⁹⁷ With the passage of time, sentiment from the faculty,

⁹³ *Birmingham-Southern College Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees Minutes* (Birmingham, 1973), 26.

⁹⁴ *Ibid*, 11 November 2003.

⁹⁵ Tanner, 11 November 2003.

⁹⁶ Anita Baker, "A Tale of Two Colleges," *Fort Worth-Houston Telegraph*, 20 May, 1984, 5-6.

⁹⁷ Tanner, 11 November 2003.

staff, students, and the Methodist Church began to grow in favor of halting relocation of and the negotiations to sell the college.⁹⁸

With Miles continuing to receive extensions for the purchase of the college, the struggle to maintain 'Southern's original campus gained momentum. By December of 1974, the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees recommended that Birmingham-Southern neither sale nor relocate.⁹⁹ Instead, the recommendation stated that 'Southern was to continue to preserve the current campus and refurbish and revamp the buildings and grounds. The discussion of selling the campus had begun to affect the enrollment and created concern among faculty and staff. By April of 1975, both the faculty and students passed resolutions expressing their wishes for the college not be sold to Miles, or any other college.¹⁰⁰ The resolution also expressed the opposition of relocation the college. The college also heard from the two Methodist conferences, the North Alabama and Alabama/West Florida, which jointly owned the school, express their opposition to the discussions taking place. At this time, the contract expired for Miles' to negotiate the purchase of the college. May 15, 1975, marked the day that 'Southern would remain as the Hilltop. This same day the board of trustees passed a resolution to construct the present day Charles Andrew Rush Library. The college also began a successful campaign to change the portrayal of the college after the years of rumors of the college's relocation or sale.

The situations that forced the possibility of the sale, relocation, or even end of the college did not change in the spring of 1975, when the trustees decided that 'Southern would remain at Owenton. College Hills continued to decline, the college was still losing enrollment and donations, and no definitive plan for the future existed. However, the leadership of the college, as it has throughout its history, changed to accept the benefits of the college rather than to capitalize on its weaknesses. In hindsight, President Tanner remarks, "It's good that Daniel never built his city in north Shelby County."¹⁰¹ A newspaper article on 'Southern written almost ten years after its decision to stay notes, "Looking back, officials at the school said moving the campus to the suburbs would have made it tougher to attract donations, recruit students, balance the budget, and rebuild faculty morale."¹⁰² Scathed, yet steadfast, the college began an attempt to redefine and reinvent itself in the mid 1970's.

One further possibility that faced the college in the 1970's is worthy of discussion.¹⁰³ John Evins, who served for a number of years as the

⁹⁸ *The Birmingham-Southern College Executive Committee of the Board of Trustee Minutes* (Birmingham, 1975), 15.

⁹⁹ *The Birmingham-Southern College Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees* (Birmingham, 1975), 26.

¹⁰⁰ *The Birmingham-Southern College Board of Trustee Minutes* (Birmingham, 1975), 23.

¹⁰¹ Tanner, 11 November 2003.

¹⁰² Anita Baker, "A Tale of Two Colleges," *Fort Worth-Houston Telegraph*, 20 May, 1984, 5-6.

¹⁰³ All information is taken from Evins, 17 October 2003. Mr. Evins is 92 when this interview was given, but his experience and service record allow for the possibility of this option to have existed.

Chairman of the Committee on Long Range Campus Development, states that a possibility of selling the campus to the remnants of the Central Conference of the North Alabama United Methodist Church existed. The African-American members of the church had no college to call their own and Evins believes they would have integrated into the community. He states that an understanding existed by which the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees would sell the college to the church if it could collect the money required.

New focus and a new leader marked the rejuvenation of 'Southern. Dr. Neal Berte became college president in 1976 and immediately began fundraising.¹⁰⁴ Money began to be directed into campus development and the construction of the library began. Berte began to campaign to the city and community to reassure them that the college planned to remain at its current site indefinitely. He also began breakfast meetings of the Downtown Action Committee, which worked to improve city and community relationships.¹⁰⁵ The efforts of the new leader on the Hilltop became immediately evident.¹⁰⁶ Applications rose and the campus began to improve aesthetically.

Work also began to improve the College Hills Neighborhood. The community had drastically changed within a time period of fifteen years. At one time, the members of the Kappa Alpha Order and their dates would dress in Confederate soldier uniforms and antebellum dresses and march from 'Southern downtown to a hotel where they would have their Old South Party. In the 1970's, the KA's were limited to marching around the dorm quad.¹⁰⁷ The change in the neighborhood also saw the end of the storied McCoy United Methodist Church, which had been built diagonal from the president's home.¹⁰⁸ Regardless of these changes, Berte wished to create a partnership with the community and improve the area around the college. Talks of moving the community had upset the residents of the neighborhood. The college worked to create a financing authority to aide in providing low interest loans for home repair and to build parks around the campus.¹⁰⁹ The college attempted to show that they were not leaving the community, but rather that they wanted to be part of the larger community.¹¹⁰ Roosevelt Bell, President of the College Hills neighborhood association commented in the 1984 that, "The decision by the college to stay here has really enhanced the neighborhood."¹¹¹ The transformational change of the college helped to establish a new 'Southern in a new Birmingham.

¹⁰⁴ Garland Reeves, "'Southern on Hilltop to stay, says Berte," *The Birmingham News*, 22 February 1977, 2.

¹⁰⁵ Neal Berte, interview by Brent Pritchard, 12 November 2003.

¹⁰⁶ Irvin Penfield, interview by Brent Pritchard, 20 October 2003.

¹⁰⁷ Tommy Stevenson, "'Battle Hymn Played as Old South Burned'", *The Tuscaloosa News*, 14 March, 1978, 5.

¹⁰⁸ Buttram, 10 November 2003.

¹⁰⁹ Baker, "A Tale of Two Colleges," *Fort Worth-Houston Telegraph*, 20 May, 1984, 5-6.

¹¹⁰ Tanner, 12 November 2003.

¹¹¹ Baker, "A Tale of Two Colleges," *Fort Worth-Houston Telegraph*, 20 May, 1984, 5-6.

President Berte also began to repair its ties with the Methodist Church. The church had become upset over events in the 1960's and 1970's such as Dr. Stanford's actions, the change of power structure on the board of trustees, and the lengthy discussions of the sale or relocation of the college. The school became frustrated with the intrusiveness of some Methodist ministers on the Board of Trustees. Bishop Kenneth Goodson, who served as Bishop of the North Alabama Conference during the 1960's and 1970's, sought out opportunities to place the proper individuals in leadership positions.¹¹² Goodson was also known for attempting to expedite the segregation process in the Methodist church in the 1960's, which included Birmingham-Southern. Goodson's active pursuit of his ideas created friction some leaders of the college during Presidential searches. Between 1965 and 1975, the church provided less than one percent of the college's total annual budget.¹¹³ At this time, these events, and a number of other factors, led the college to question its partnership with the United Methodist Church. This questioning of authority resulted from a reflection of had been occurring in the larger social structure of the 1960's and 1970's.¹¹⁴

Berte wished, however, to fulfill the mission of the college, which states that it is to be in a relationship to the church.¹¹⁵ The college had been losing six hundred thousand dollars per year and need the churches assistance. 'Southern also needed to reform its recruiting base within the Methodist church to help bring in more Methodist students. Berte hired Reverend Mike Harper to be the new college chaplain. 'Southern had been without a chaplain for several years before Harper's hiring. Berte also created the Department of Church Relations, which works to improve the relationship between the college and church.¹¹⁶ Berte introduced a new church scholarship campaign and his new church in Birmingham, Canterbury United Methodist Church, chose him to serve as a delegate to the Annual Conference meetings. Through Dr. Berte's actions and commitment to the mission of the college, the college strengthened its ties to the Methodist church and further revitalized itself.

As the situation of the college began to improve, a horrific tragedy would again terrify and raise questions about the college's place in College Hills. On December 18, 1976, Quinet Sheehan, a Birmingham-Southern student, had left campus to buy a few items at a grocery store in College Hills. Sheehan never returned. On December 21, police found her dead, naked, and raped body along a roadside.¹¹⁷ A grocer, John Doyle

¹¹² Harmon, Nolan B. Jr., et al. *Virginia United Methodist Heritage: Bulletin of the Virginia Conference Historical Society* (Richmond: 1993), 12.

¹¹³ Berte, Neal. *Birmingham-Southern College: The Renewal of A Mission* (Birmingham: Birmingham-Southern College Printing Press), 1986.

¹¹⁴ Berte, 12 November 2003.

¹¹⁵ Ibid, 12 November 2003.

¹¹⁶ Harmon, *Virginia United Methodist Heritage: Bulletin of the Virginia Conference Historical Society*, 12.

¹¹⁷ Associated Press, "New trials ordered in coed death," *The Troy Messenger*, 7 April, 1981, 1.

Pennington, had also been killed in an apparent robbery attempt. Two men were eventually found guilty and sentenced to death for Sheehan's murder, but years of appeals followed. Sheehan's murder vividly brought to life the issue of the security of the college.

The possibility of surrounding the campus with a fence and creating one entrance had been previously discussed before the Sheehan murder.¹¹⁸ Now trustees, students, and faculty viewed a fence as a necessary step to provide a safe campus community. Berte immediately went about raising money for the fence, but at the same time, he consulted the College Hills community to explain why the fence was being built. Berte felt that it was very important to explain to the neighborhood that the fence was built as a safety device and for recruitment purposes rather than to keep the community from entering the college grounds. The community leadership understood Berte's concern and urged him to erect a fence to surround the college. In the 1977-78 year, saw the completion of the fence and, while the trials of the Sheehan murderers would continue to create negative press for the college for years to come, allowed the college to continue its existence safely in the College Hills neighborhood.

As the college changed to accept its new identity and place within the College Hills community and Birmingham, the dynamic of the student body began to transform as well. African-Americans had joined the student body and as President Tanner remarks, "Everyone was on their best behavior with integration."¹¹⁹ African-American students were well received by their white counterparts. No open hostilities existed, but an underlying sense of separatism still existed among the students. Comments, that were not intended to be negative, were made about the areas around Birmingham that had declined due to white flight. A number of African-American students lived in these areas. While not intentionally attempting to divide student sentiment, the outcome of Civil Rights and its aftermath still created division among 'Southern students. The issue raised in the trustees' integration discussions of African-Americans not being able to meet the requirement standards or not being able to perform on 'Southern's academic level proved to be untrue. The ratio of commuter to resident students among the African-American portion of the student body was almost fifty percent.¹²⁰

As the clamor of the Civil Rights Movement died down in the 1970's, African-Americans began to find their place in campus life at 'Southern.¹²¹ They participated in events ranging from athletics to the

¹¹⁸ All information on the creation of the campus fence comes from Berte, 12 November 2003.

¹¹⁹ Tanner, 10 November 2003.

¹²⁰ Angela Fischer-Hall, Interview by Brent Pritchard, 2 November 2003. Hall attended 'Southern from 1978-1982.

¹²¹ All information on African-American involvement in campus life is taken from *The Southerner*, Volume 3, # 4, 20, October, 1970, 4., Volume 6, # 7, 7 November, 1973, 4., Volume 9, # 8, 12., Volume 8, # 5, 1., Hall 2 November 2003., Penfield 20 October 2003., and Tanner 10 October 2003.

Greek system. As early as 1970, did African-American males break into the white dominated Greek system. In 1975, the SGA appointed a special black representative to voice the needs and concerns of African-American students. In such a short amount of time, African-Americans began to make their mark on campus life of Birmingham-Southern College. However, these students felt that a greater need existed for African-Americans to create an organization to work for their benefit. With this mindset, African-Americans created the Black Student Union as an organization that they could call their own and that would further work to improve race relations.

The beginning of the Black Student Union, referred to as the BSU, can be traced back to circa 1967-68 when Dr. and Mrs. Penfield would have different speakers and events for African-Americans at their home. Julian Bond, an outspoken civil rights speaker, and Richard Arrington, city council member and future mayor of Birmingham, were among the speakers at the Penfield's'. In 1970, Dr. John Monroe, Dean of Freshman studies at Miles, spoke at 'Southern and suggested the formation of a Black Student Union. The BSU formed quickly as an organization in which African-Americans could come together in a community atmosphere to work on common goals or to vent frustrations over certain topics. Dr. Penfield, who served as provost of the college for over thirty years, became the BSU's first advisor. In the early years of the BSU, as is today, both African-Americans and whites were members of the organization. In time, the organization grew and began to identify specific goals and actions they wished to accomplish.

Consisting primarily of African-Americans, the BSU met on a regular basis and became a tightly knit group. The organization, as Hall recalls, was comprised of half service and half-social aspects. It served, at times, to be a forum for discussions to help African-Americans to find their place in the community and school. Many African-Americans still felt that they did not have the ability to be as active members of the campus community as their white counterparts. One of the BSU's goals was to lobby the college's administration to add more African-Americans to teaching and administration positions. BSU members felt that African-Americans still existed in too much of a service role and needed to be elevated to leadership positions. They lobbied for African-American professors, promoting African-American SGA candidates, and encouraging more participation among African-Americans in Greek life. In 1975, the school added an African-American to the board of trustees and by 1980, thirteen percent of the administrative positions of the college were filled by African-Americans, thanks, in part, to the help of the BSU.

By the mid 1970's, the BSU began to challenge the status quo of the dominant 'Southern Greek life.'¹²² African-Americans had been accepted

¹²² All information from the BSU challenging Greek life comes from Susan Lair, "Goals of the Black Student Union," *The Southerner*, 23 October, 1975, 1-2.

by the Greek system as early as 1970, but the BSU was not content with the level of participation of African-Americans. In 1975, the BSU began investigating the Greek system for facts regarding the continuation of segregation. Millie Solomon, a member of the BSU, remarks about blatant attempts to keep the Greek system segregated in an article from *The Southerner*, "We wouldn't put up with that." The BSU felt the investigation into the Greek system was a starting place for the continued attempt to reach equality on campus. In 1979-80, Alpha Kappa Alpha, an African-American sorority was formed at 'Southern and the creation of one more sorority and two other fraternities followed. This allowed more African-American involvement in the Greek system and participation in events like Greek Week. By the mid 1980's, traditionally white sororities, such as Zeta Tau Alpha, accepted African-Americans.

The BSU had achieved its goal of providing more opportunities for African-Americans to join campus organizations. They also sponsored such events as a Black History Week and gospel singings. Throughout the 1980's and 1990's, the BSU continued to provide growth and acceptance of African-Americans while continuing to improve race relations. The BSU did cease to exist for several years in the 1990's, but within recent years has received the Organization of the Year award for the president of the college. In 2003, the BSU successfully campaigned for and elected the school's first African-American SGA President.¹²³ The BSU continues today to educate the college about African-American culture and to improve race relations.

III.

The life and history of Birmingham-Southern College significantly and drastically altered due to the development of civil rights of African-Americans. The Civil Rights Movement served to be the most obvious example of changed, but the underlying acceptance of African-Americans by whites and vice-versa serves as an additional process that continues to this day. There are definitive levels of this change that Birmingham-Southern College's history exhibits. The first is the direct effects shown in the campus community. The most notable and major event in transforming the college is Ulysses Bennett's peaceful integration in 1965. A college cast in the background of slavery that materialized during the reconstruction of the South finally recognizing the need of equality of education for all people. This served to be the most momentous internal change displayed throughout the college's history due to the civil rights of African-Americans.

The progression of thought within the Methodist church also influenced the college. In the 1930's, the teachings of social justice first found their footholds in the academia of 'Southern. These teachings that 'Southern students received, some who later became Methodist minis-

¹²³ Chris Friedman, interview by Brent Pritchard, 10 November 2003.

ters, are among the leaders of the Methodist church in the 1960's who first preached for equality and justice. A number of these ministers also served as integral parts of the decision making process to integrate the college. Through these teachings, when the Civil Rights Movement occurred, some members of society were able to realize the injustices suffered by African-Americans. These teachings are what also led 'Southern students, Thomas Reeves, Martha Turnipseed, and others, to participate in the Civil Rights Movement. It is through these teachings, in conjunction with the movement for equality of African-Americans, that these issues directly affected the life of the college.

The emerging freedom of African-Americans led to the community around the college to transform as well. As the struggle for freedom ensued, whites moved out of their communities to the residential suburbs, rather than sharing them with African-Americans. This massive migration of races occurred in the surrounding College Hills neighborhood of the college. In time, property value dropped and safety became an issue of the college. With the college remaining steadfast in its new surroundings, the college partnered with the community to attempt to rejuvenate and repair what years of non-cooperation had created. The development of civil rights of African-Americans directly affected the neighborhood around 'Southern and its future. However, from the shift from white to African-American in the neighborhood, to the partnership with the college indicatively shows that attitudes too, changed.

Finally, the building of the fence around campus and its story summarizes 'Southern's change within the community. Once white flight occurred and safety became an issue, the college erected the fence. The college accepted the African-Americans outside the campus gates into its academic world, but at the same time, the college protected its place in the community. The development of African-Americans led the college to ensure that its safety and purpose remained intact within the community.

The next level of change results from the direct threats to the status quo and survival of the college from the development of civil rights of African-Americans. The Civil Rights Movements first questioned Birmingham-Southern's future. 'Southern's location to the events taking place within the city, the student involvement in the movement, the dire situation and negative stigma of Birmingham at the time, and Dr. Stanford's progressive attitudes and actions all led trustees to start to question Birmingham-Southern's position in Birmingham. The challenge of integration served as the first test of the status quo of 'Southern. Fortunately, many other institutions of higher education fought the battles of integration before 'Southern and the trustees of the college were able to learn from other's mistakes.

Again, the decline of the College Hills neighborhood forced trustees to question their place within the immediate community. With white flight, questions of safety and security, the erection of the campus fence, and the tragic death of Quinet Sheehan, trustees had to ponder

'Southern's place. The resulting lack of donations and falling enrollment also forced the decision makers to ask difficult questions about the future of the college. These answers to these questions were the possibility to relocate, which would have been very possible if Hugh Daniel had more money and had built his city in north Shelby County, and plans to sell the college. In the early 1970's, if Miles College would have had at least nine million dollars Birmingham-Southern would have been sold. A college created by slave owners sold to a traditionally African-American college. The college would have ceased to exist.

At the same time, these events led the college to question its partnership with the church. Through the progressive actions of some clergy due to the fight for equality of African-Americans, a number of trustees became upset with the Methodist church. The relationship between the school and church soured and resentment resonated on each side. Eventually, the college reconciled with the church, which provided needed support, donations, and students.

The development of civil rights of African-Americans did directly threaten the status quo and the survival of the college. With African-Americans waging the war for equality in Birmingham's streets, the college first questioned its future. The integration of the college solved the race issue, but its relations with the community did not resolve easily. The fear of the encroachment of African-Americans and the issue of safety, coupled with financial and administrative problems, led the college to question its own existence. The additional weakening of ties with the Methodist church, which parented the institution, partially resulted from the developing rights of African-Americans. Nevertheless, the strive for equality allowed 'Southern to become the true diversified educational institution it is today.

Finally, the deepest level of change exhibited by the college due to the development of civil rights of African-Americans is revealed through the actions and trends of the students, faculty, and staff. From, in 1856 where white students were slave owners, to today where the races live in coexistence is the first element of change. The fact that the races interact and not simply tolerate the other is evident that attitudes of students, and society, have changed. The teachings of social justice at 'Southern led students to question the accepted status quo of their backgrounds and some even chose to participate in the struggle for equality, the Civil Rights Movement.

When segregation occurred, little unrest occurred on 'Southern's campus. The ease of the transition to desegregation reflects the changing attitudes of students on campus. The students of 'Southern had lived in a community that served as an educational and social enclave, now became surrounded by the development of civil rights of African-Americans. The acceptance by whites and the lack of a backlash movement is further evidence that the races were learning to co-exist together. Within time, the addition of the Black Student Union to campus details

the level of change. Only five to ten years after an all white college integrates, a campus organization works for the equality of the race that which is a severe majority. Its aims and goals, at times, challenged the status quo of the campus community. For the races to co-exist, with the possibility of these tensions, demonstrates that the development of civil rights of African-Americans directly affected the lives of whites in the campus community.

These developments also affected the faculty of the college. At times, faculty hid in their academic world on the Hilltop, but some questioned the injustices of Birmingham and urged students to act. William and Trudy Meyer and Tom Ogeltree were among these who felt their lives changing with the developments of the African-American peoples struggle for civil rights. Finally, we see the leadership of the college change. From President Stuart to Stanford and Tanner to Berte, individual changes that occurred in these men and their administrations indicate that the struggles taking place beyond the Hilltop greatly affected the life of the college.

In conclusion, the development of civil rights of African-Americans could possibly serve as the most important movement in the history of the college. The number of issues that are tangent to the world that is Birmingham-Southern is almost innumerable and cannot be fully explained or rationalized in any historical work. The transformation that took place over the course of the college's history is not evident walking between the buildings on campus or even looking at the student body. The changes are seen by examining the college, in the scope of the city, within the dynamic of the times it has survived. The development of the civil rights of African-Americans did alter the course of Birmingham-Southern. The life of the college transformed as the events that transpired during its history brought the students and faculty of the college to accept African-Americans as a member of their community. This equality reached by the college served an important role and reflected the greater need for Birmingham itself to accept all men as equals and to open all opportunities and facets of life to all. The Hilltop has always represented the best of a liberal arts education. Southern's rich history and tradition of excellence is now shared by all men, regardless of color.

Works Consulted

Primary Sources

- Baker, Anita. "A Tale of Two Colleges." *Fort Worth- Houston Telegraph*, 20 May, 1984, 5-6.
- Bennett, Ulysses. Interview by Jessica Missios. *Birmingham-Southern College Bulletin*. Birmingham: Birmingham-Southern College Press, 1995.
- Beiman, Irving. "B-S to take over skyscraper." *The Birmingham News*, 16 December, 1973, 2.
- Berte, Neal R. *Birmingham-Southern College: The Renewal of A Mission*. Birmingham: Birmingham-Southern College Printing Press, 1986.
- Berte, Neal R. Interview by Brent Pritchard. 12 November 2003.
- Birmingham-Southern College Board of Trustee Minutes*. Birmingham: 14 March, 1962, 30 October, 1963, 15 January, 1965, 11 May, 1973, 13 August, 1973, 1 April, 1975, 15 May, 1975.
- Birmingham-Southern College Executive Committee of the Board of Trustee Minutes*. Birmingham: 8 April, 1960, 18 August, 1961, 8 January, 1965, 28 September, 1965, 12 April, 1973, 7 June, 1973, 2 August, 1973, 12 December, 1974, 15 May, 1975.
- Boroff, David. "The Genteel Tradition On A Southern Campus." *Harper's Magazine*, November 1959, 1-8.
- "BSC quizzed about hirings." *The Birmingham News*, 7 June, 1980, 4.
- Buttram, Reverend Mac. Interview by Brent Pritchard. 10 November, 2003.
- Corley, Robert G. and Samuel N. Stayer. *View from the Hilltop: The First 125 Years of Birmingham-Southern College*. Birmingham: Birmingham Publishing Company, 1981.
- "Court affirms murder convictions in deaths of BSC coed and grocer." *The Birmingham News*, 7 June, 1982, 1.
- "Death Penalty Upheld In Sheehan Slaying." *Columbus Enquirer*, 5 October, 1983, 1.
- Doctrines And Discipline of The Methodist Church* 1956. Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1956.
- Evins, John. Interview by Brent Pritchard. 17 October, 2003.
- Friedman, Chris. Interview by Brent Pritchard. 10 November 2003.
- Graves, Daniel. Interview by Brent Pritchard. 12 November, 2003.
- Hall, Angela Fischer-. Interview by Brent Pritchard. 2 November, 2003.
- Harper, Reverend Mike. Interview by Brent Pritchard. 4 April 2003.
- Harvey, Joseph. "Students Urged to Weigh Acts." *The Birmingham News*, 9 March 1960, 5.
- "Hilltop News Reprints Dean Abernethy's Speech." *The Hilltop News*, 3 May 1963, 4.
- "Hilltop News Reprints Dr. Phillips' Speech." *The Hilltop News*, 27 September 1963, 2.

- Hubbs, Guy W. Interview by Brent Pritchard. 11 November 2003.
- Jenkins, George. Interview by Brent Pritchard. 14 April 2003.
- Joiner, Andrea. "Birmingham-Southern Halts plan to sell campus to Miles." *The Birmingham News*, 17 May 1975, 3.
- Koestline, Reverend Noel. Interview by Jessica Missios. 22 April 1997.
- Lair, Susan. "Goals of The Black Student Union." *The Southerner*, 23 October, 1975, 1-2.
- Matthews, Bill. "Students, 'Southern, and Civil Rights." *The Hilltop News*, 1 May 1964: 2.
- Meyer, William and Trudy. Letter. *The Hilltop News*, 3 May 1963, 4.
- "Mood on the Campus: Negro grad optimistic." *The Birmingham News*, 2 April, 1967, 8.
- "New trials ordered in coed death." *Troy Messenger*, 7 April, 1981, 1.
- Pinkard, Calvin M., et al. *Journal of The North Alabama Conference of The Methodist Church Twenty-Fifth Session*. Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1963.
- Precise, Reverend Bud. Interview by Brent Pritchard. 8 April 2003.
- Perry, Wilbur D. *A History of Birmingham-Southern College: 1856-1931*. Nashville: The Pantheon Press, 1931.
- Penfield, Dr. Irvin. Interview by Brent Pritchard. 20 October, 2003.
- Reeves, Garland. "'Southern on Hilltop to stay, says Berte." *The Birmingham News*, 22 February 1977, 2.
- Sailsbury, Harrison E, "Fear and Hatred Grip Birmingham: Racial Tension Smoldering After Belated Sitdowns," *The New York Times*, 12 April 1960.
- Seitz, Karl. "BSC is not planning to join ranks of dying-Dean Tanner." *The Birmingham News*, 9 December, 1970, 1,5.
- Southern Accent: Birmingham-Southern College 1964* Vol. 23 Birmingham, 1964.
- Stevenson, Tommy. "'Battle Hymn' played as Old South Burned." *The Tuscaloosa News*, 14 March 1978, 5.
- Student Government Association. "SGA Condemns Recent Violence." *The Hilltop News*, 20 September 1963, 1.
- Tanner, Dr. Ralph. Interview by Brent Pritchard. 2, 6, 7, 10, 11 November 2003.
- The Southerner*, Volume 3, # 4, 20, October, 1970, 4., Volume 6, # 7, 7 November, 1973, 4., Volume 9, # 8, 12., Volume 8, # 5, 1.
- "Tensions in the Community," *The Birmingham News*, 5 June, 1966, 2.
- Weaver, Dr. O.C. Interview by Brent Pritchard. 5 March 2003.
- Weaver, Oliver C. and Joseph H. Parks. *Birmingham-Southern College 1856-1956*. Nashville: The Parthenon Press, 1957.

Secondary Sources

- Barnard, William D. *Dixiecrats and Democrats; Alabama Politics, 1942-1950*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2002.

- Clark, E. Culpepper. *The Schoolhouse Door*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Frederickson, Karl A. *The Dixiecrat Revolt and The End of the Solid South, 1932-1968*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001
- Harmon, Nolan B. Jr., et al. *Virginia United Methodist Heritage: Bulletin of the Virginia Conference Historical Society*. Richmond: 1993.
- McWhorter, Diane. *Carry Me Home: Birmingham, Alabama: The Climatic Battle of the Civil Rights Revolution*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001.
- Muse, Dr. William V. *Auburn University: An Alabama Treasure and an International Resource*. Princeton: Princeton Academic Press, Inc., 1998.
- Padgett, Charles S. "Without Hysteria or Unnecessary Disturbance: Desegregation at Spring Hill College, Mobile, Alabama, 1948-1954" 41, no.2 (2001): 167-188.
- Stanford, Henry King. *Campus Under Political Fire and Other Essays*. Columbus, GA: X-Press Printing, 2000.
- Thornton, J. Mills III. *Dividing Lines: Municipal Politics and the Struggle for Civil Rights in Montgomery, Birmingham, and Selma*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2002.
- Wicker, Wesley Keel. *Of Time and Place: The Presidential Odyssey of Dr. Henry King Stanford*. Athens, GA: 1990.
- White, Marjorie L. *A Walk to Freedom: The Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth and The Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights, 1956-1964*. Birmingham: Birmingham Historical Society, 1998.

A Fatal Pause: Abraham Lincoln and Joseph Hooker

Charles Roberts

Only those generals who gain successes, can set up dictators. What I now ask of you is military success, and I will risk the dictatorship.¹

Abraham Lincoln's famous letter to Joseph Hooker, his so-called appointment letter, could easily have been a description of Hooker written by many in the army and government. He was a "brave and skilful" soldier, as well as self-confident, but Hooker had some important flaws. Lincoln scolded him for intrigues against General Ambrose E. Burnside and for his loose tongue in general, especially his advocating a dictator.² However, it was his final paragraph which mentioned the largest concern on Lincoln's mind. He warned Hooker to "beware of rashness," but to gain victories "with energy, and sleepless vigilance."³ Lincoln's greatest concern about Hooker, he told Noah Brooks, was that Hooker was "over-confident."⁴ It was unexpected, then, that Hooker would famously "lose his nerve," in the words of T. Harry Williams, at the Battle of Chancellorsville.⁵ While Abraham Lincoln expected Hooker's greatest fault to be rashness, in actuality it was a loss of nerve, a hesitation, which was Hooker's failing at Chancellorsville and the maneuvers that followed. It was also this hesitation to take the offensive which caused Lincoln to lose faith in Hooker and eventually to accept his resignation.

History has not been kind to Joseph Hooker. It's difficult to find historians who defend Hooker as a man and almost impossible to find one that defends his military record while commanding the Army of the Potomac. Twenty years after Chancellorsville Hooker's first major biographer, Samuel P. Bates, published his account with an openly Hooker bias, a result of his having interviewed Hooker for *The Battle of Chancellorsville*.⁶ As Hooker's literary executor, Bates' records found their way four years later into Clarence Cough Buel and Robert Underwood Johnson's *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*.⁷ After these works, it was generally downhill for Hooker's reputation as an independent commander. The best biography of Hooker, Walter H. Hebert's *Fighting Joe*

¹ Abraham Lincoln in a letter to Joseph Hooker. Abraham Lincoln, *Abraham Lincoln: His Speeches and Writings*, ed. Roy P. Basler (Cleveland: De Capo, 1946), 694.

² *Ibid.*, 693.

³ *Ibid.*, 694.

⁴ David Herbert Donald, *Lincoln* (New York: Touchstone, 1995), 433.

⁵ T. Harry Williams, *Lincoln and His Generals* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952), 238.

⁶ Samuel P. Bates, *The Battle of Chancellorsville* (Meadeville, Pa: E.T. Bates, 1883).

⁷ Clarence Cough Buel and Robert Underwood Johnson, *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War, Being For the Most Part Contributions by Union and Confederate Officers*, 4 vols. (New York: Century, 1887).

Hooker, describes his headquarters during the battle of Chancellorsville, for example, as being in a state of "uncertainty ... amounting to panic."⁸ Hebert essentially accuses Hooker of being unwilling to wage an offensive campaign against Robert E. Lee once Hooker was in close contact with the Confederate Forces and asserts that this reluctance resulted in his defeat.⁹ Stephen E. Ambrose claims that Hooker "fell completely apart" when Stonewall Jackson made his unexpected assault on the Union right.¹⁰ T. Harry Williams, one of Hooker's most famous critics, claims that Hooker gave every indication that he feared Lee and the army that had defeated him at Chancellorsville.¹¹ Kenneth P. Williams states simply that Hooker was "completely unfit for army command."¹² *American Heritage* ran an article in which Hooker is presented as being "close to winning" the war when "he suffered an incredible failure of nerve."¹³ Even Hooker's supporters are forced to admit his failures as a general. After all, Stephen W. Sears' essay "In Defense of Fighting Joe Hooker" appears in the aptly titled *Civil War Generals in Defeat*.¹⁴

Even the defenses of Hooker, like those made by Sears and Mark E. Neely, Jr., recognize his failings. Neely admits that Hooker did indeed "fail" "through "loss of confidence," but goes on to blame the terrain of Chancellorsville and Hooker's decision to fight there, rather than any mistakes made during the battle, for Hooker's defeat.¹⁵ Sears spends much time arguing that Hooker's famous confession after Chancellorsville – "For once I lost confidence in Hooker" – was never really uttered.¹⁶ Only then does he go on to say that the battle was "winnable" until Hooker was injured.¹⁷ Sears further blames Hooker's lieutenants, much as Hooker himself did.¹⁸

However, to properly understand Sears' defense of Hooker's conduct, a brief description of the course of the battle is required. To be able to clearly understand the campaign and the expectations Lincoln had for

⁸ Walter H. Hebert, *Fighting Joe Hooker* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1944), 209-210.

⁹ For example, Hebert calls Hooker's cautious orders to General John Sedgwick on April 29th to be the "first note of weakness to creep into" his plan. *Ibid.*, 195.

¹⁰ Stephen E. Ambrose, *Halleck: Lincoln's Chief of Staff* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1962), 132.

¹¹ Williams, *Lincoln and His Generals*, 252.

¹² Kenneth P. Williams, *Lincoln Finds a General* vol. 2 (New York: Macmillan, 1959), 585.

¹³ Gene Smith, "The Destruction of Fighting Joe Hooker," *American Heritage* 44, no. 6 (1993): 95.

¹⁴ Stephen W. Sears, "In Defense of Fighting Joe Hooker," in *Civil War Generals in Defeat*, ed. Steven E. Woodworth (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1999), 119-140.

¹⁵ Mark E. Neely, Jr., "Wilderness and the Cult of Manliness: Hooker, Lincoln, and Defeat," in *Lincoln's Generals*, ed. Gabor S. Boritt (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 58, 61.

¹⁶ Sears, "In Defense," 124-26. However Sears is quick to accept Hooker's supposed response to Lincoln's letter ("a letter as a father might write to his son") that many believe to be false. *Ibid.*, 133. See Hebert, *Hooker*, 170.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 135.

¹⁸ In Sears' words, "there was more than ample justification for each of the charges he leveled against his lieutenants." *Ibid.*, 135. Also Sears perhaps unfairly fails to take into account the generally negative opinion that Hooker's lieutenants had for his handling of the battle.

Hooker requires an understanding of Hooker's appointment and the months leading up to the battle of Chancellorsville. It is here that Lincoln's first criticism against Hooker in his appointment letter, regarding Hooker's intrigues against General Burnside, becomes clear.

Lincoln's letter specifically said that Hooker had done "a great wrong to the country, and to a [...] brother officer."¹⁹ Lincoln is perhaps correct about the second part – Hooker had indeed been "unsparing of Burnside."²⁰ It could hardly be claimed, though, that criticism of Burnside, which led to his being removed more quickly, was a great wrong to the country. As usual, T. Harry Williams states the facts most forcefully: "Burnside was destroying the morale and unity of the officers and the army. In fact, Burnside as a commander was destroying himself."²¹ Furthermore, in the highly political army, many officers were changing political views and working against their higher-ups; what others called 'intrigue,' Hooker called 'pragmatism.'²² In any event, Hooker was, as Lincoln noted, extremely open with his criticism of Burnside. In fact, Hooker was open with all of his criticism, be it for a person, a unit, or an army; this was the man, after all, who supposedly asked "Who ever saw a dead cavalryman?"²³

Hooker's loose criticisms are an indication of his generally indiscreet, arrogant, and rash nature. Lincoln had good reason to be concerned about overconfidence. As Neely remarks, "almost everyone" who writes about Chancellorsville is embarrassed by Hooker's bravado.²⁴ Even Hooker's accidental nickname, "Fighting Joe," indicated the feeling of many that he would be too willing to rush into battle.²⁵ Especially compared to other generals like Grant and McClellan, Hooker was as different from other officers as night from day.²⁶ When Hooker first met Lincoln, after First Bull Run, he told the president that it was "neither vanity nor boasting in me to declare that I am a damned sight better general than you, Sir, had on that field."²⁷ It is important to note, though, that anyone studying the Union command of that day is inclined to agree with Hooker's assessment.²⁸ Lincoln must have taken this into considera-

¹⁹ Lincoln, *Collected Writings*, 693.

²⁰ Hebert, *Hooker*, 161. Though Hooker said, as Hebert also mentions, that Hooker said he "never thwarted Burnside in any way, shape or manner." *Ibid.*, 170.

²¹ Williams, *Lincoln and His Generals*, 206.

²² Sears, "In Defense," 133.

²³ Hebert, *Hooker*, 177. Hebert only says that the quote is "often accredited to Hooker."

²⁴ Neely, "Wilderness," 72.

²⁵ Daniel E. Sutherland, *Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville: The Dare Mark Campaign* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 95. Hooker got the nickname apparently as a typesetter's error, or an error of the reading public; the original headline it came from ran "Fighting – Joe Hooker." Hebert, *Hooker*, 91.

²⁶ Stephen W. Sears, *Chancellorsville* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1996), 57.

²⁷ Hebert, *Hooker*, 49. It is not entirely clear where this quote comes from, though it is, as Hebert mentions in his bibliographic notes, "Repeated in many newspapers and all articles concerning Hooker."

²⁸ Sears, "In Defense," 132.

tion, both Hooker's boasting and the accuracy of those boasts. At the meeting to decide who would replace General George B. McClellan (a meeting which eventually selected Hooker's predecessor Burnside), Lincoln said that he thought as much of Hooker as any man, but he feared the general got excited.²⁹ It is clear then that Lincoln was concerned about Hooker's tendency towards overconfidence and rashness, even to the degree that Hooker's chances for independent command were lessened.

Doubts, however, about Hooker's overconfidence must surely have been quelled by his careful reorganization of the Army of the Potomac after his appointment to command. Hooker had already shown his administrative skills and attention to detail as a grand-division commander.³⁰ Hebert calls Hooker's work reorganizing and building the morale of the Army of the Potomac "a contribution [...] more important than any of the fighting he had engaged in as division and corps commander."³¹ To Hooker's good fortune, the bad weather that had so hindered Burnside's last military movements enabled Hooker to ignore General Henry Halleck, Lincoln's general-in-chief, who encouraged him to begin attacking the Confederates.³² Hooker was instead able to wait until he believed his army was ready to begin the campaign.

Hooker's initial moves against Lee are generally considered by most historians to be masterful. Stephen E. Ambrose even compares Hooker's planning to that of Alexander the Great.³³ No less harsh a critic than T. Harry Williams says that the plan "bore the marks of brilliance."³⁴ Yet still there were indications that overconfidence might cost Hooker the campaign. He had already disquieted the president at their early April meetings by prefacing his plans with phrases like "when I get to Richmond."³⁵ On April 30, 1863, General Order No. 47 announced that the "enemy must either ingloriously fly, or come out from behind his defenses and give us battle on our ground, where certain destruction awaits him."³⁶ He claimed that the Confederate army was "legitimate property of the Army of the Potomac."³⁷ Hooker was giving every outward appearance of a man completely certain of victory.

In many ways, it is difficult to consider Hooker too overconfident, even if his statements did carry a touch of tempting fate, because like

²⁹ Hebert, *Hooker*, 128.

³⁰ Williams, *Lincoln Finds a General*, vol. 2, 560.

³¹ Hebert, *Hooker*, 184.

³² Williams, *Lincoln Finds a General*, vol. 2, 560.

³³ Ambrose, *Halleck*, 132. Specifically, Alexander's river crossing at Jhylum.

³⁴ Williams, *Lincoln and His Generals*, 236.

³⁵ Donald, *Lincoln*, 434.

³⁶ United States, *War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, vol. 25 part 1 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889), 171. Hereafter referred to as "O.R."

³⁷ Hebert, *Hooker*, 196

after First Bull Run he seemed to be so clearly correct. Any impartial observer would have agreed at the time, and many would agree now, that the Confederates were indeed headed for defeat if not disaster. Many in the army agreed with Hooker's assessment; provost marshal General Marsena Rudolph Patrick, for example, in his diary wrote on April 30th "unless [the Confederates] are playing us a deep game, we shall cut them sadly to pieces."³⁸ All that was left for Hooker was to continue advancing, and all of his boasting would have seemed prophetic. Instead, in the most scrutinized moment of his career, Hooker hesitated. Suddenly he was in close quarters with an enemy that was somewhere around him, and doubts about where the enemy was and what should be done next lead to the uncertainty that "paralyzed the vigor and action of General Hooker."³⁹ There was also the matter of Hooker being a bit surprised. He had expected opposition to fade away, but instead Lee had responded boldly and forcefully to Hooker's first advances.⁴⁰

In the key moment of Hooker's career, he ordered George Sykes, in command of one division of the Fifth Corps, to suspend his attack of May 1st.⁴¹ The order to end the assault was protested Darius Couch, Henry Warner Slocum, and George Meade, who were three of his Corps commanders, and also by Sykes and Winfield Scott Hancock, another division commander.⁴² Couch was advancing when the order from Hooker came to withdraw. Thinking there must be some mistake, Couch replied with a message to be sure that Hooker actually intended him to withdraw. Hooker did. Couch, considered to have been a sort of unofficial second-in-command to Hooker, wrote that he was "disgusted at the general's vacillation."⁴³ Leaving a later meeting with Hooker, Couch recorded that he "retired from [Hooker's] presence with the belief that my commanding general was a whipped man."⁴⁴ Couch was so displeased by Hooker's handling of the army that he eventually requested, and received, a transfer after the battle.⁴⁵

Sears claims that everything had gone just as Hooker planned, and that the battle was entirely winnable until Hooker's May 3rd injury. Even by the third, Hooker's situation was "far from bad if he had taken advantage of it."⁴⁶ Hooker had wanted to force the Confederates into a frontal assault destined to fail in the face of superior Union positions, and this is what he did. However, Sears goes farther, arguing that Hooker's han-

³⁸ Marsena Rudolph Patrick, *Inside Lincoln's Army*, ed. David S. Sparks (New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1964), 239.

³⁹ Buel and Johnson, *Battles*, vol. 3, 176.

⁴⁰ Gamaliel Bradford, *Union Portraits* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916), 49.

⁴¹ Hebert, *Hooker*, 199.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 200; 175-76.

⁴³ Buel and Johnson, *Battles*, vol. 3, 159.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 161.

⁴⁵ Neely, "Wilderness," 73.

⁴⁶ Colin. R. Ballard, *The Military Genius of Abraham Lincoln* (Cleveland: World Publishing, 1965), 157.

dling of the battle was one which should have led to a victory.⁴⁷ This is a difficult case to make and an even more difficult one to accept. To a degree, the pre-battle maneuvers had indeed gone as planned. He was a bit behind schedule, but Hooker's troops were mostly in place, Lee was confused about his aims, and most importantly, Hooker had the initiative.⁴⁸ It is entirely possible that if Hooker had not been injured, the battle would have gone to the Federals, not because of any particular skill of Hooker, but rather because of the confusion that the loss of a commander in battle, any commander, entails. During the battle, unable to see personally what was going on, Hooker failed to grasp the general situation and therefore was unable to bring his well-laid plans to fruition.⁴⁹ Even using a defensive plan based on maneuver, as Sears asserts Hooker was doing, he would have had to maintain the initiative and force Lee to react. It was not a defensive battle plan which so doomed Hooker; defensive positioning was probably the most effective during a war that saw the introduction of powerful long-range weapons. Instead it was a defensive mindset, a willingness to allow Lee to initiate battle with the intention of responding to his maneuvers.

There is evidence that Hooker had fallen into this defensive mindset as battle began. He sent a circular at 9:30 the morning of May 1st in which he ordered his commanders to throw out pickets and keep their corps in hand wherever they were, and that "the safety of this army depends upon this being rigidly executed."⁵⁰ It is admirable that Hooker was so concerned for the safety of the army, but were these words really from the same man who claimed the rebel army to be property of the Army of the Potomac? However, the clearest evidence of Hooker's loss of nerve comes in the period immediately after his injury and after the battle. He was facing a Confederate army that was too small even to effectively damage "the Union masses," but he called a council of his commanders and, against the majority opinion, decided to withdraw back across the Rappahannock.⁵¹

After he recovered from his injury, the only thought on Hooker's mind saving the army.⁵² Hooker's injury left him virtually useless for the rest of the battle, and it is not entirely clear if it continued to affect his thinking afterwards.⁵³ As Lincoln himself noted, had the shot hit Hooker, instead of only stunning him, the battle could have been a great success.⁵⁴

⁴⁷ Sears, "In Defense," 135.

⁴⁸ Williams, *Lincoln Finds a General*, vol. 2, 574.

⁴⁹ Bradford, *Portraits*, 50.

⁵⁰ O.R., 323.

⁵¹ Bradford, *Portraits*, 51.

⁵² Sears, "In Defense," 137.

⁵³ Bradford, *Portraits*, 50.

⁵⁴ Donald, *Lincoln*, 438. Though it is difficult to agree with Donald when he says Hooker was "on the verge of victory." In a winnable situation, yes, but not necessarily on the verge of winning.

However, it was clear well before he was injured that Hooker had no intention of mounting any offensive maneuvers.⁵⁵ It might be valuable here to compare Hooker's reaction to defeat at virtually the same spot where General Ulysses S. Grant would face a much worse one, at the Battle of the Wilderness a year later. Instead of withdrawing, Grant pushed on, pressing Lee further back into Virginia, so that despite defeat Lincoln "did not despair."⁵⁶

Hooker did not push on. He pulled back across the Rappahannock despite the fact that a large portion of his army was never engaged, and even those who saw fighting were generally in good shape. As Hooker himself put it in a May 6th, 1863 telegram to Lincoln, no more than "three Corps' ... of my troops have been engaged."⁵⁷ Apparently Lincoln did not need to remind him that he had, during his early April visit to Hooker's headquarters, told Couch and Hooker "in your next fight – put in all of your men."⁵⁸ Hooker could not effectively use his whole army because he was unable to wage war on the map.⁵⁹ Despite his administrative talents, Hooker had stumbled badly in a conflict where he could not see the field and personally direct the battle. As Bradford puts it, the "army was unconquered, but the general was badly beaten."⁶⁰ Hooker had lost his nerve as an independent commander. For this reason, he lost Chancellorsville. It would also be a loss of nerve, and unwillingness to face the enemy, which would finally cost Hooker the confidence of his commander-in-chief.

When Lincoln visited Hooker on May 7th, his usual letter in hand, he was pleasantly surprised by the army's condition, but not by the condition of its commander, who seemed to have learned nothing from his recent defeat.⁶¹ Lincoln's letter to Hooker indicates his hopefulness and that he still had confidence in Hooker. Admitting that the recent movement failed its objective, Lincoln looked forward to an "early movement" which would take advantage of the enemy's communication being broken and which would "help to supersede the bad moral effect of the recent one."⁶² Hooker's response a week later, on May 13th, must have been terribly disappointing to Lincoln. Reminiscent of McClellan, Hooker claimed that the Confederates were "much my superior" numerically.⁶³ This and Lincoln's May 14th response perhaps mark the turning point of his relationship with Hooker.

⁵⁵ Ballard, *Military Genius*, 158.

⁵⁶ Donald, *Lincoln*, 500.

⁵⁷ Library of Congress Manuscript Division, *The Abraham Lincoln Papers at the Library of Congress* as found in <<http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/alhtml/malhome.html>> Mar. 16 2003. Hereafter referred to as "*Lincoln Papers*."

⁵⁸ Buel and Johnson, *Battles*, vol. 3, 154.

⁵⁹ Williams, *Lincoln and His Generals*, 214.

⁶⁰ Bradford, *Portraits*, 52.

⁶¹ Donald, *Lincoln*, 438.

⁶² Lincoln, *Collected Writings*, 695.

⁶³ Hooker to Lincoln, May 13, 1863, *Lincoln Papers*.

In that response Lincoln refers back to his hopes for an early movement against the enemy but, as he wrote, "that idea has now passed away." Instead, he was willing to settle for Hooker keeping the enemy "at bay, and out of other mischief." Lincoln also brought up the fact that some of Hooker's officers did not give Hooker "their entire confidence," a potentially "ruinous" situation.⁶⁴ Hooker reportedly asked Lincoln what officers criticized him, but Lincoln refused to tell him.⁶⁵ Apparently the criticisms of Hooker by military men were beginning to change Lincoln's opinion of Hooker's role in the defeat at Chancellorsville.⁶⁶ He was not yet ready to replace Hooker, though. Hooker reported to Lincoln at the beginning of June that the enemy was beginning to break camp, and proposed to attack the rear of Lee's army at Fredericksburg.⁶⁷ Hooker's plan was "completely wrong," in the words of T. Harry Williams.⁶⁸ Lincoln apparently recognized this fact. He told Hooker, in his homespun way, to avoid "any risk of being entangled upon the river, like an ox jumped half over a fence."⁶⁹ On the 10th, Hooker sent a telegram to Lincoln asking about a possible march on Richmond.⁷⁰ Lincoln's response that same day gave the essence of his military strategy throughout the war. "Lee's army," he told Hooker, "and not Richmond, is your true objective."⁷¹ What Lincoln wanted was for Hooker to attack and defeat Lee. This, he felt, could win the war in the east. He implored Hooker on the 14th of June to attack: "If the head of Lee's army is at Martinsburg and the tail of it on the Plank Road [...] the animal must be very slim somewhere. Could you not break him?"⁷²

By now it seemed that all resolution Hooker had was gone.⁷³ Various historians have concluded that Hooker was afraid of Lee. Stephen E. Ambrose claims this was Hooker's motivation for planning to attack Richmond, for example.⁷⁴ The harshest critic of Hooker after Chancellorsville, however, is Williams, who goes so far as to write that Hooker wanted to lose his command because he was afraid of Lee, and so he tried deliberately to provoke Lincoln and Halleck.⁷⁵ Despite Williams' assertions, it seems that Hooker had no intention of losing his command when he resigned. The circumstances around his resignation are important to understanding the reasons behind Hooker's offering it. After Chancellorsville, as

64 Lincoln to Hooker, May 14, 1863, *Lincoln Papers*.

65 Williams, *Lincoln and His Generals*, 246.

66 *Ibid.*, 247.

67 Hooker to Lincoln, June 5, 1863, *Lincoln Papers*.

68 Williams, *Lincoln and His Generals*, 252.

69 Lincoln, *Collected Writings*, 698.

70 Hebert, *Hooker*, 234.

71 Lincoln to Hooker, June 10, 1863, *Lincoln Papers*.

72 Lincoln, *Collected Writings*, 708-09.

73 Williams, *Lincoln and His Generals*, 258.

74 Ambrose, *Halleck*, 133.

75 Williams, *Lincoln and His Generals*, 259.

another invasion by Lee loomed large, Lincoln was much less willing to give Hooker the free hand he had enjoyed during the spring of 1863.⁷⁶ Lincoln and Halleck's continued interference led to the incident over which Hooker resigned. The specifics involved Hooker demanding to be allowed to remove the garrison from Maryland Heights for his own use against Lee, which probably would have been a serious strategic blunder, because Maryland Heights controlled several strategic points including bridges across the Potomac, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, and Harpers Ferry.⁷⁷ When Halleck ordered him to maintain Harpers Ferry, Hooker resigned.⁷⁸ Hooker had insisted on being able to use the troops defending Washington, always a touchy subject for Lincoln, and Lincoln refused to allow it.

Hooker's resignation tells much about his state of mind at the time. Again claiming that he faced an enemy force larger than his own, Hooker declared that this, along with his instructions to guard Harpers Ferry and Washington, made it impossible for him to comply with his commands.⁷⁹ This telegram carries none of the confidence and boasting that Hooker had made a name from in twenty years of soldiering. It is possible that Hooker intended his telegram to have a different purpose, however. The simplest explanation for Hooker's resignation is that he was just angry over Halleck's constant interference and refusals.⁸⁰ Losing his temper and resigning seems much more in Hooker's blustering nature than his apparent unwillingness to engage the enemy, so this line of reasoning carries weight. Similarly, it can be argued that Hooker was angry with Halleck, but hoped to use a threat of resignation to force Lincoln and Halleck to give him greater control over his army.⁸¹ Indeed, it is entirely possible that Hooker had no expectation of his resignation being accepted. Lee was invading Pennsylvania, after all, and it was clear that a major battle was imminent. Hooker continued to act as though he would remain in command, issuing orders and preparing for Lee.⁸² If Hooker did expect Lincoln to refuse his resignation, as he apparently did, then Hooker did not know Lincoln nearly as well as Lincoln knew Hooker.

Lincoln had watched Hooker's maneuvers of late May and June with anxiety. He already mentioned his concern to Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles that "Hooker might commit the same fault as McClellan and lose his chance."⁸³ Furthermore, Hooker had failed to recognize that Lincoln's suggestions and country advice were actually orders.⁸⁴ For his

⁷⁶ Bradford, *Portraits*, 55.

⁷⁷ Williams, *Lincoln Finds a General*, vol. 2, 648.

⁷⁸ Donald, *Lincoln*, 444.

⁷⁹ Hooker to Halleck, June 27, 1863, *Lincoln Papers*.

⁸⁰ Ballard, *Military Genius*, 163.

⁸¹ Sears, for example, claims that it was a desire for a showdown with Halleck, who Hooker was certainly on bad terms with, that prompted Hooker's resignation. Sears, "In Defense," 130.

⁸² Williams, *Lincoln Finds a General*, vol. 2, 650.

⁸³ Williams, *Lincoln and His Generals*, 258.

⁸⁴ Donald, *Lincoln*, 439.

part Lincoln was glad to be rid of Hooker, who had already lost the confidence of his commander-in-chief, his subordinates, and the public.⁸⁵ Even if Hooker had still carried the faith of his officers and the public, Lincoln himself had several reasons to relieve Hooker. Hooker was becoming high-strung, easily agitated by Lincoln or Halleck's commands. Hooker had lost his nerve and thereby lost a battle, and it looked perfectly likely to happen again. Perhaps most importantly, Hooker had offered his resignation when it was obvious that a major battle was about to take place. Having already been defeated once, he was risking losing his only chance to erase the stain of that defeat and possibly end the war. Lincoln had already decided that Hooker had problems facing the enemy, and nothing could have solidified that notion more than an offer of resignation, the surest sign of a lack of confidence.⁸⁶ Lincoln had dealt with McClellan and Burnside enough; he was not willing to continue on with another commander who lacked the nerve to engage the enemy.

So it was Meade, and not Hooker, who commanded the Army of the Potomac at Gettysburg. However, even after that victory, Meade let Lincoln down, failing to crush the Confederates as they escaped over the Potomac and on to fight for another two years. It was not until he found Grant that Lincoln had a general who would press the Confederates until surrender. Lincoln's final opinion of Hooker was in many ways indicative of how he felt about all of the Army of the Potomac's commanders before Grant. From Lincoln's point of view, his commanders were slow to move and slower to engage the enemy. None could face the fact that only Lincoln seemed to be able to, that to defeat the Confederacy in the east would necessarily require a crushing victory that never allowed the rebel army to reform. With Hooker, the case is much more interesting, since Lincoln was at first so concerned with Hooker's rashness and over-willingness to give battle. Lincoln's worries were exactly backwards, however. Hooker's nerve, vigor, and confidence all failed him at the crucial moment. After that, Hooker's command was never the same. Just as Hooker lost his aggressiveness, Lincoln lost confidence in him. Losing confidence in Hooker as he had Hooker's predecessors, Lincoln relieved him of command and continued his search for a commander who could bring him victory in the east.

⁸⁵ Williams, *Lincoln Finds a General*, vol. 2, 651.

⁸⁶ Ballard, *Military Genius*, 164.

Bibliography

Primary Documents

- Buel, Clarence Cough and Robert Underwood Johnson, eds. *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*. 4 vols. New York: Century Co., 1887.
- Library of Congress Manuscript Division. *The Abraham Lincoln Papers at the Library of Congress*. Mar. 16 2003.
<<http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/alhtml/malhome.html>>
- Lincoln, Abraham. *Abraham Lincoln: His Speeches and Writings*. Ed. Roy P. Basler. Cleveland: Da Capo Press, 1946.
- Patrick, Marsena Rudolph. *Inside Lincoln's Army*. Edited by David S. Sparks. New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1964.
- United States. *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, 128 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889.

Secondary Sources

- Ambrose, Stephen E. *Halleck: Lincoln's Chief of Staff*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1962.
- Ballard, Colin R. *The Military Genius of Abraham Lincoln*. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1965.
- Bates, Samuel P. *The Battle of Chancellorsville*. Meadville, Pa: E.T. Bates, 1883.
- Boritt, Gabor S. ed. *Lincoln's Generals*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Bradford, Gamaliel. *Union Portraits*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916.
- Catton, Bruce. *Mr. Lincoln's Army*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1954.
- Cross, Edward. "Completely Outgeneralled." *Civil War Times Illustrated* 34, no.3 (1995): 24, 78-83.
- Donald, David Herbert. *Lincoln*. New York: Touchstone, 1995.
- Furguson, Ernest B. *Chancellorsville 1863*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992.
- Gallagher, Gary W., ed. *Chancellorsville: The Battle and Its Aftermath*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Bongard, David L., Trevor N. Dupuy, and Curt Johnson, eds. *The Harper Encyclopedia of Military Biography*. New York: Harper Collins, 1992.
- Hendrick, Burton J. *Lincoln's War Cabinet*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1946.
- Herbert, Walter H. *Fighting Joe Hooker*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1944.
- Herndon, William H. *Herndon's Lincoln: The True Story of a Great Life*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970.
- Sears, Stephen W. *Chancellorsville*. New York and Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1996.

- Smith, Gene. "The Destruction of Fighting Joe Hooker." *American Heritage*. 44, no.6 (1993): 95-103.
- Stackpole, Edward J. *Chancellorsville: Lee's Greatest Battle*. Harrisburg, Pa: Telegraph Press, 1958.
- Sutherland, Daniel E. *Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville: The Dare Mark Campaign*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Williams. Kenneth P. *Lincoln Finds a General*. 5 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1959.
- Williams, T. Harry. *Lincoln and His Generals*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952. *Lincoln and The Radicals*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972.
- Woodworth, Steven E., ed. *Civil War Generals In Defeat*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1999.

Hardwired to Connect?

Biology's Influence on Civil Society

Tim Johnson

Social philosophy and science operate in distinct realms: the former critically analyzes fundamental beliefs through logical thought, while the latter empirically investigates the mechanisms of the natural world. However, a social epidemic sweeping through today's children and adolescents has warranted the union of these two disciplines. The current generation of young Americans reports higher levels of anxiety than psychiatric patients in the 1950s (Institute for American Values 5). Along with this anxiety, twenty percent seriously consider suicide. Consequently, scholars at the National Research Council note that twenty-five percent of adolescents never reach full adulthood; however, several groundbreaking studies neuro-biologically implicate social experience as a major factor in childhood development (IAV 6). Infusing social philosophy with scientific research, the Commission on Children at Risk submits the authoritative community as a model for progress concerning children and adolescents, underprivileged children, and moral and spiritual development. While the study at times extends beyond the research through speculative suggestions for society, its recommendations overall appropriately prescribe authoritative communities for these problems in children.

In order to address the problems facing children and society today, the Commission on Children at Risk has developed an ideal model of society known as the authoritative community. "Authoritative" refers to the manner in which these institutions deal with children; they provide not only nurturing warmth but also limitations and expectations for development. "Community" addresses the manner in which these institutions, meeting the biological needs of children, provide them opportunities for developing associations with members across society. These two ideas synthesize to define authoritative communities as "groups that live out the [two] types of connectedness that our children increasingly lack." The first type, human connections, generally applies to families—children and adolescents—and in specific instances to underprivileged citizens. Along with these human associations, moral and spiritual associations are also fundamental to human development.

II. Children and Adolescence

The commission begins its report by addressing children's biological need for associations. According to the research performed by neurologist Allan Schore of the UCLA School of Medicine, "our brains are physically wired to develop in tandem with another's...before words are even spoken" (IAV16). Recent studies of the production rate of oxytocin

and vasopressin—neurotransmitters found in the reward circuitry of the brain—illustrate this insight, indicating higher levels of pleasure in those more engaged in interpersonal associations. From this self-organization of the brain, in which neurological connections are created through interactions with other humans, the report suggests that associations can affect development either by facilitating or inhibiting growth. According to the study, relationships with parents can strengthen or weaken a child's susceptibility to psychiatric disorders later in life, a conclusion that might trigger far-reaching implications, most notably concerning the manner in which society attempts to prevent delinquency.

From these scientific findings (that human minds are biologically primed for associations), the commission recommends several changes for families based on the tenets of the authoritative community. The commission initially posits that a child's family is his or her first authoritative community; as such, it recommends that society reexamine its behavior and cultural view of the family. In doing so, it strongly urges Americans to "consider a range of changes in [their] laws and public policies" in order to allow children to grow up with two nurturing parents (IAV 48). It continues by addressing the economic factors preventing parents from properly raising their children. In particular, the commission implores businesses to provide parents with "flexible and reduced work hours, short term parental leave, and [increased] job security" (IAV 48).

These recommendations concerning the treatment of children, and subsequently families, all emerge from the scientific research presented; specifically, they illustrate one of the studies' central themes: children need, if not require, social engagement with their parents in order to achieve successful adulthood. The social and economic proposals especially address several key issues facing parents in modern society. The report urges the United States to exchange the perception of parenting as a luxury for the view of parenting as producing of model citizens. This important distinction can be illustrated through the example of delinquency. Traditionally, society blames the child or his nature for his psychological problems and deals with the child after his problem is discovered. However, new scientific findings show that less-nurturing parents increase the chances for delinquency in children, a problem that eventually affects society as a whole. Parental nurturing is paramount to childhood development. Yet, parents are less able to nurture when they are inundated with economic, emotional, or marital problems. Therefore, in order to make parents able to raise children, society must deliver the privileges they require.

These suggestions also tease another important issue from the research: fathers, underrated by society, play a crucial role in the development of their children. A study of pubescent teenage girls demonstrates this idea, offering that girls living with biological fathers experience delayed puberty. While the merits of this postponed development are debatable, nearly every study on the impact of fathers suggests that

they positively influence children. For example, several studies show that children who live apart from their fathers are three times as likely to commit suicide and twice as likely to drop out of school (Hewlett and West165). As such, the commission's insight into the benefit of two parents corresponds to biological evidence for the positive effects of fathers in raising children.

While these recommendations accurately address the issues facing biological parents, they ignore non-traditional parents, such as in adopted families. The commission's report never explicitly mentions the need for association only with biological parents. As such, the commission's work is a disservice to the parental efforts of many functional families in America. To remedy this situation, the commission should have compared their results to studies that analyze children's associative responses to non-biological strangers. If these results suggest that biological parents are paramount to development, then the report could have further justified its focus on biological families. If they indicate that genetic links do not affect associations between parents and children, the commission could have addressed other family structures, such as orphanages and adopted families, which would have the same opportunity to provide parental associations with children.

Children are not the sole focus of the commission's work. The commission's report presents scientific research and proposals for adolescents as well. According to its research, adolescence is a period of significant brain growth, maturation, and neurological remodeling. During this period, considerable development occurs in the prefrontal cortex and frontal lobes—regions of the brain concerned with judgment and insight. Due to the rewiring of the brain that occurs in these areas, adolescents experience "reward deficiency," a condition that explains teenage behavior. Lacking certain dopamine receptors, adolescents require much stronger stimuli than do fully developed adults. Consequently, adolescents often engage in dangerous risk taking and novelty seeking in order to overcome seemingly systemic unhappiness and depression associated with their age.

Nonetheless, hope exists in new scientific discoveries connecting social environment and biology. Recent studies by Larry Young of Emory University on mice show that early nurturing experiences "have a powerful effect on emotional reactivity of the offspring" (IAV 17). These early nurturing experiences permanently affect behavioral responses to stressful situations. For example, pups with increased maternal affection have "altered levels of stress hormone receptors" in the brain (IAV 17). The study accounts for genetics through cross-fostering experiments, in which unrelated pups raised by good mothers experienced the same behavioral results. According to researchers, this effect applies to both mice, and higher order organisms, such as humans. Therefore, if placed in the proper environments, teenagers can experience fundamental changes in their "neurocircuitry," and achieve greater contentment.

In response to this research, the report offers proposals designed to address the needs of adolescents through authoritative communities. Recognizing teenagers' propensity for risk taking, the commission suggests that society "provide healthy opportunities" to meet young people's needs. The commission, however, never offers specific alternatives; it merely presents the ethos of these substitutes. Central to this call for healthy alternatives is the recognition of the differences between adolescents and adults. According to Michael Resnick, of the University of Minnesota, these measures should mark a "commitment that [adolescents] are a resource to be developed, not problems to be solved."

From this integration of teenagers' neurological differences into its sense of community, the commission suggests society deal with adolescents differently from others, yet with dignity. Under these new auspices, the community can address teenagers' tendencies towards risk taking and thrill seeking not as problems to be dealt with, but means through which to interrelate with teenagers. For example, rather than leave adolescents to their own devices for stimuli such as drugs or alcohol, authoritative communities can offer "risky" alternatives which illicit similar responses safely, such as roller coasters or extreme sports like mountain climbing. Due to these safer alternatives, the United States should witness a dramatic decline in teenage delinquency, a relieving prospect for society.

In addition to these adolescent psychosocial changes, the report also discusses new scientific data concerning gender and development. Widespread psychological theories maintain that environmental factors help define gender differences, such as the manner in which societies distinguish boys from girls; however, according to recent research, the role of biology in this process of gender differentiation cannot be denied. For example, male and female brains appear to develop differently in response to different hormones. During this time, the male brain becomes more sensitive to testosterone and aggression, while the female brain becomes more responsive to estrogen. Yet, this biological basis for gender, as stressed throughout the report, soon comes under the control of social experience that has the ability to affect a child's pre-dispositions, evident in societies' pubescent rights of passage such as Bar Mitzvahs or 'Sweet 16s.' This relationship in which sexually mature individuals must meet social requirements demonstrates the universal connection between social experience and biology.

The commission continues its adolescent-related proposals by addressing its data concerning gender development. Specifically, the report addresses the manner in which society views the "gender needs of adolescents" (IAV 49). According to the commission, society in recent decades has leaned towards viewing genders androgynously, a trend designed to remove the fundamental differences between male and female socialization. This approach often neglects the process of "sexually enculturating the young," leaving adolescents alone to discover the meaning of their sexuality; as a result, "adolescent-created rituals of tran-

sition" are often less pro-social and lead to serious consequences (IAV 49). In response to this tendency, the commission advises that society address males' and females' developing gender and sexuality separately, through mentoring and guidance. This adult engagement with adolescents, according to the authors, will yield invaluable results for community, such as lower rates of teenage pregnancy in females and lower rates of rape and sexual aggression in males.

These recommendations represent accurate analyses of their scientific data. Boys and girls do not develop identically and therefore should not be raised identically. The sociological effects of these measures, a decline in teen pregnancy and rape, predicted by the commission, also seem well founded. According to the Washington State Department of Health, the past several years have witnessed a dramatic decline in the rate of teen pregnancy (Reed and Whitbeck 2002). Similar reports by the Department of Justice show that the rate of rape is also on the decline (Department of Justice 2002). These two downward trends strongly correlate to significant public awareness campaigns, similar to those submitted by the commission, strongly suggesting that the commission's move for increased awareness of sociobiological foundations for gender will perpetuate the current decline in teenage pregnancy and rape. However, in its attempts to dispel the view of environmentally determined gender, the commission should carefully distinguish increased awareness of gender from propagating societal gender stereotypes. For example, while it is true society should not attempt to assume a boy could be raised as a girl, it must also not stunt atypical choices, such as women choosing professions in male-dominated fields such as engineering. This middle ground between androgyny and stereotypes should be the authoritative communities' goal.

III. Underprivileged Children

Along with a general analysis of its effects on children and adolescents, the commission focuses especially on the effects of the associative biological needs of children in under-privileged communities. The report cites a study by Stephen Suomi in which monkeys were analyzed for the presence of an "at risk" gene—an anxiety gene prevalent in twenty percent of monkeys. In certain social situations, the monkeys with the anxiety gene generate higher levels of stress hormones—another illustration of biological responses to social environment—and experience a higher rate of alcohol abuse. Yet, when nurturing and capable mothers raise these at risk individuals, this predisposition towards anxiety vanishes, along with the monkey's alcohol abuse. Often these monkeys engage in much less aggressive behavior and even flourish as leaders in the primate community. According to researchers, these at risk monkeys "improved social environment has modulated a heritable vulnerability" (IAV 20). In response to this groundbreaking research, the Commission on Children at Risk proposes several measures aimed at helping underpriv-

ileged children achieve their full potential. The report suggests that radical changes must occur in society's mindset concerning "disadvantaged, low income neighborhoods" (IAV 50). Currently disadvantaged neighborhoods' problems are considered "them problems," isolated from the rest of the country. In order for change to occur, the report cites the necessity of the dissolution of this view of inner city crises. From the subsequent rejuvenation of commitment, it proposes that the federal government allocate a certain percentage of its gross domestic product to children, especially disadvantaged ones. Finally, the report recommends the creation of a new tax credit for contributions to "charitable organizations whose primary purpose is improving the lives of children and youth" (IAV 50).

The report's proposals are well founded in its scientific research; the commission aptly recognizes that the same positive social effects in monkeys can be seen in human behavior and gene expression as well. For example, its call for greater social commitment towards the under-privileged signifies the commission's desire to increase awareness of the problems facing children in these communities, and along with this awareness, volunteerism. This call for volunteerism can be seen in the report's proposal for tax credits, a move that will allow citizens throughout society greater economic incentive to donate their resources towards the cause of bettering the situations of children. In addition, its proposal for the allocation of a portion of the gross domestic product, although vague in its appropriation, directs economic and social assistance to the underprivileged.

While these measures do attempt to strengthen authoritative communities' consideration of disadvantaged children, they do not fully address the specific problems facing these children. Rather than merely calling for greater national commitment toward rebuilding authoritative communities in low-income neighborhoods, the commission should recognize specific issues facing disadvantaged children and provide direction for support. For example, the commission could have specifically addressed the educational needs of underprivileged children. This new scientific data shows that the expression of an "at risk" gene is primarily influenced by social environment, which might apply to other genes as well, such as intelligence. The commission should have solicited additional studies to assess this possibility. With positive results, the commission could have fundamentally changed the way the country addresses the educational needs of the underprivileged by challenging society or the government to invest a certain portion of its wealth in the education of underprivileged children.

Another specific topic concerned with this new scientific data is the nature of criminality. A common model of criminality regards crime as an anomaly inherent to the individual, an internal malfunction. This mindset however, ignores common bonds shared by many criminals, such as growing up fatherless, or growing up underprivileged. Contrary

to this mindset, the new scientific research warrants future studies, such as the study of the mouse "at risk" gene, to determine if societal problems do in fact nurture these anomalies, as seen in the common bonds among criminals. Consequently, positive scientific results would suggest that the proper way to treat criminality is not solely in response to individual acts, but by targeting the systemic problems that cultivate these individuals. In its effort to suggest ways to improve the community, the Commission on Children at Risk could then have called for strong social and federal intervention in low-income neighborhoods, easing factors such as fatherlessness and poverty that lead to crime. The results of this focus on education and criminality, which call a more intelligent and lawful populace, would fundamentally enhance communities.

IV. Morality and Spirituality

In its examination of the biological need for interpersonal associations, the Commission on Children at Risk illustrates that children are biologically "born to attach;" in the final section of its report, the commission attempts to relate this innate drive to morality and spirituality. The commission begins by noting Barbara Stilwell, who examines neurotransmitter levels in infant brains (IAV 25). According to Dr. Stilwell, at early stages in human development, parents play a large neurological role in forming morality: what the child should and should not do. When a parent rewards a child for good behavior, more neurotransmitters are released, associating security and pleasure with certain actions. This relationship can prove either beneficial or catastrophic for the child. For example, Dr. Stilwell, along with other researchers, finds common, troubling symptoms in children deprived of their mothers, including "superficial relationships, inaccessibility, and a lack of emotional response" (IAV 26). From this research, the commission suggests that morality develops through biologically primed associations, such as with parent-child relationships, and that society should therefore be aware of this process.

The commission's report applies this discussion of morality to adolescence, discussing the replacement of parents with specific role models. According to anthropologist David Gutmann, adolescents find morality "outside of the self," apart from their conditioned childhood responses (IAV 26). This externalization involves the "idealization...of those whom [adolescents] admire," a process by which teenagers adopt their role models' moral behavior. Accordingly, the commission notes the importance of mentors. The report charges mentors with the protection of adolescents from dangers. In this sense, the commission desires to utilize this biological drive for imitation found in teenagers in order to pass along pro-social morals.

The commission's analysis of mentors as mediators for moral diffusion accurately synthesizes its scientific research. However, while it is good to have some sense of morality, biology is blind to the value of the morality it transmits: biologically transferred morality is moral rela-

tivism. Racism, for example, is considered immoral throughout most of the United States; yet, biological associations via neurotransmitters and adolescent imitation facilitate racist indoctrination of the young as if it were Christian morality. As such, the commission should propose a societal mechanism for choosing the nation's moral direction: civil society. For example, the federal government was the only power able to stop slavery, a practice considered moral by many Southerners; yet, it did not act until protests arose from civil society. Only through the safeguard of civil society can this biological knowledge safely help develop moral future generations.

The commission concludes its discussion of moral development by addressing the positive effects of spirituality on humans in an attempt to prove the biological need for spiritual associations. Citing common trends, the commission asserts that "religious practice correlates to higher levels of reported happiness," as well as higher levels of "hope and optimism" (IAV 29). In addition to these reports, religious teens are also more likely to "volunteer in the community" (IAV 30). In consideration of these trends, the commission suggests that although a direct causal relationship between spirituality and benefits cannot be determined due to the improvable nature of spiritual associations, "there are good reasons to suspect that causal factors may be involved" (IAV 30).

The report continues its commentary on spirituality by citing a study by Eugene d'Aquili in which individuals' brains were imaged during "contemplative prayer and meditation" (IAV 32). D'Aquili found in this study that the frontal lobe and prefrontal cortex—cerebral regions associated with social behavior, personality, and emotion—experience increased neuro-transmitter activity during these religious practices. From these findings, the commission concludes that "the human brain appears to be organized to ask ultimate questions and seek ultimate answers," a pursuit intimately connected to "spiritual seeking and experience and to religious belief" (IAV 32).

Finally, the commission analyzes spirituality's effects on sociability. Spirituality, according to the commission, increases social connectedness and exposes people to wholesome messages. Religion has a stake in the child's development, and thus offers a "shared vision of the good life" (IAV 30). In this sense, religion treats children and adolescents as an end, not as a means. It is not concerned with winning awards via children, such as a sports team. Rather, religion attempts to enlighten youths about valuable life lessons such as community, long-term planning, and multi-generational relationship building.

In response to these positive religious influences and research, the commission offers several proposals for society concerning religiosity. The commission recommends that society as a whole, and youth advocates in particular, should "purposively seek to promote the spiritual development in children" (IAV 49). Despite Americans' diverse religious backgrounds, to deny or ignore spirituality in adolescents may lead to

"drinking, unbridled consumerism, petty crime, sexual precocity, or flirtations with violence" (IAV 31). According to the commission, cultivating a "search for spiritual [associations] with the Creator," a process inherent to adolescence, is a challenge to be dealt with, not avoided (IAV 31).

These suggestions, however noble in effort, stem from faulty conclusions about the scientific evidence for spirituality. The first piece of evidence used by the report associates religious practice with reported happiness. Its proposed causal relationship is shaky, based on other statistics presented by the report. According to the report, ninety-six percent of teenagers believe in God; yet, the report also maintains that "twenty percent of students reported having seriously considered suicide in the past year" (IAV 9). The report also states that forty percent of adolescents claim to pray frequently while maintaining that "US children as a group [report] more anxiety and depression than did children who were psychiatric patients in the 1950s" (IAV 8). The report presents two conclusions about American youths: they are at risk and they are spiritual. Therefore, the report's assertion that spirituality directly causes happiness is flawed.

The commission continues by noting Eugene d'Aquili's study of religious practices' effects on the brain. From the results, the commission concludes that exercises such as meditation and prayer satisfy the human mind's innate need for spiritual associations. This deduction by the commission, however, is erroneous. While it is not unfair to say that a component of prayer satisfies an innate desire in the human mind, evident in the release of pleasure neurotransmitters, it cannot be assumed that religious practices solely illicit this response. The commission ignores other studies on relaxing secular practices, a control for D'Aquili's experiment. Without a control, the commission cannot suggest what is truly fundamental to religion. For example, the commission ignores the possibility that meditation and prayer involve a level of introspection and relaxation. Modern psychiatry currently utilizes several religious practices, such as "mindfulness," in order to ease patient suffering, also a process involving the release of neurotransmitters (IAV 32). This psychiatric practice weakens the commission's conclusion, suggesting that some factor of religious practices soothes the body, but not necessarily due to its spirituality.

In light of these conclusions, the commission should have analyzed the religious institutions themselves instead of looking to innate spirituality as a fount of connectedness. Obviously there is some aspect of these institutions that facilitates positive social connectedness, and usually promotes healthy views of moral lifestyles, something that cannot be said for most youth activities. The commission should have called for more research contrasting religious institutions' effects on neurotransmitter levels with other practices' effects. The commission could have gleaned from these studies the positive benefits that religious institutions and practices provide children and applied them to secular organizations.

V. Conclusions

While the commission's conclusions about the spiritual aspects of society exemplify speculative suggestions for authoritative communities, they do not overshadow the valuable insights provided by the report. Through parent-child interactions, stabilization of teenagers through healthy alternatives, and a rejuvenation of commitment in the problems of at-risk neighborhoods, the authoritative community appropriately addresses the increasing social problems plaguing children and adolescents today. This prototype aptly fuses social philosophy and science while bettering society.

Works Cited

- Commission for Children at Risk. *Hardwired to Connect*. New York: Institute for American Values, 2003 Department of Justice. National Crime Victimization Survey. 2002.
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/cvict.htm>
- Hewlett, S., C. West. *The War Against Parents*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1998.
- Reed, P., J. Whitbeck. "Abortion and teen pregnancy rates decline, continuing decade-long trend." Washington State Department of Health, 2002.

*Displacement, the Loss of Self, and the Reconstruction of a Culturally Specific Identity in Toni Morrison's *Beloved* and Leslie Marmon Silko's *Ceremony**

Aynsley Harrow

The relationship between place and identity, a concept central to sociologic and anthropologic discourse, has garnered much interest from the literary community. According to the phenomenological perspective of Yi-Fu Tuan, the spaces humans occupy are transformed into places, as each locale achieves meaning and definition (136). Through study of human experience of place, it becomes evident that as places are created so is the need to be rooted in that place. Individuals have an innate desire for home and community and for "a sense of belonging, for some place that is recognized as mine, as yours, as ours" (Lutwack 214). By effecting a fundamental attachment to a place, for example the intimate setting of home or the camaraderie of community life, the individual is able to secure an identity or true self.

Given the relationship between place and identity, it follows that a separation from community or displacement from home parallels a loss of self. In Toni Morrison's *Beloved*, Sethe's violence against her children results in the detachment from community, displacement from the home, and subsequent loss of a socially and racially constructed identity. Shunned by the African American community, Sethe and her family struggle with the horror and misery of their circumstance. In response to experiencing a detachment from place, Sethe and her family endeavor to reclaim not only their community ties but also to reintegrate the stories of their past and present, a process which affords formation of a culturally specific identity and a story specifically theirs.

In Leslie Marmon Silko's *Ceremony*, Tayo struggles to overcome the cultural and communal isolation, consequent of his military service. He returns from war psychologically distraught, displaced from his community and tribal way of life. To reestablish his tribal identity, Tayo must not only come to terms with his mixed status but must also embrace the tribal ceremonies and stories celebrating Mother Earth. For Native Americans, the Laguna Pueblo in particular, "the landscape is a character, or characters – and to eliminate the land is to eliminate the story itself" (Piper 3). Through reintegration into the Laguna Pueblo tribe and reconnection with the land, Tayo is healed and his narrative is incorpo-

rated into the larger tribal story. This paper examines the loss of self and the reconstruction of a culturally specific identity by Sethe's family in Toni Morrison's *Beloved* and Tayo in Leslie Marmon Silko's *Ceremony*. The aforementioned characters are displaced, separated from their communities and home environment.

Traditionally the home represents a place to recover and recuperate, a place "where our fundamental needs are heeded and cared for without fuss" (Yi-Fu Tuan 137). Within the discourse of slavery, however, home for African Americans is restrictive and violent, a place where slave masters rarely permit free will and choice. Sweet Home, the slave plantation in Kentucky where Sethe lives and works, denotes the "(im)possibility of home within the institution of chattel slavery" (Jesser 3). Ownership of Sweet Home exchanges hands from Mr. Garner to Schoolteacher, and the slave community of Sweet Home is further burdened by the limitations and boundaries of their circumstance.

Under the ownership of Mr. Garner, the men at Sweet Home are granted more freedom than the typical slave, as Sweet Home slaves possess merit; they are "believed and trusted, but most of all they are listened to" (131). However, life at Sweet Home does not afford the sweetness of the utopian community its name suggests. By permitting a sense of self, "Garner's model farm places his slaves in a false position of community" (Jesser 4). As a result, the Sweet Home men falsely create the impression of community life, while the reality of their situation is the injustice of enslavement. In contrast to Garner's rule, the shift in ownership to Schoolteacher underscores the horrific landscape of Sweet Home and the cruelty endured by slave labor. Under the control of Schoolteacher, slaves are nothing more than the property of their master, regularly beaten to reestablish the essential boundary between the "definers [and] [...] the defined" (199).

The slave community at Sweet Home may be false, as terms of the community are solely defined by the slave master, yet for Sethe, Paul D. Halle, Baby Suggs, Sixo, and others, the Sweet Home community provides the means to "form a counter-community" committed to finding a plan of escape (Jesser 6). The community is ultimately broken as their escape route fails, and though Sethe successfully flees from Sweet Home, she is simultaneously fleeing the only community and home she is able to claim.

Once she arrives safely at 124 Bluestone Road, Sethe's recollection of her experience at Sweet Home becomes blurred by her "rememory," resulting in mixed emotions and the uncertainty of her plantation past. Her Sweet Home experience is during a time of "fire and brimstone [...]" and although there was not a leaf on that farm that did not make her want to scream, it rolled itself out before her in shameless beauty. It never looked as terrible as it was and it made [Sethe] wonder if hell was a pretty place too" (6). The depiction of Sweet Home as both a home and a place of hell creates an ambiguity recognized by young Denver who candidly

asks, "[h]ow come everybody [who] run off from Sweet Home can't stop talking about it? Look like if it was so sweet you would have stayed" (14).

Structurally different than Sweet Home, the house at 124 Bluestone Road, owned by white abolitionists and rented to Baby Suggs, is a source of sustenance and love to not only Sethe and her family but also the surrounding community. As the "nerve center and heart of the black community," 124 affords the exchange of food and dialogue between families and friends; it is the place where Baby Suggs, "draws the community together with her preaching, maintains her doctrine of openness, grace, and love for every black woman, man, and child" (Jesser 11). Prior to "the Misery" in which the house transforms into "the plaything of spirits and the home of the chafed," 124 is the place in which "Baby Suggs, holy, love, cautioned, fed, chastised, and soothed" (90-1). Messages were left for visitors while weary travelers stopped to gather a moment's rest. Life at 124 is vibrant, bustling with visitors of the surrounding community who frequently gather to partake of food and conversation.

124, however, feeds more than the literal hunger of the community; it provides the community with its spiritual rations as well. Through Baby Suggs' preaching and prayer, the African American community acknowledges the importance of 124 as a place of nurture and affirmation. Following her taxing escape from Sweet Home, Sethe revels in this "paradise, this utopia, this house fully alive with no need to take the ugly out" (Jesser 12). She is washed, her injuries attended, and her spirit revived; for a short twenty-eight days, Sethe is embraced by the larger black community and is able to experience a true sense of community without the strings of slavery attached.

This image of 124 as a social and spiritual hub is threatened during a community celebration organized by Baby Suggs, in which Sethe and her family are stigmatized and rejected by the black community. Shortly after Sethe and her family arrive at 124, Baby Suggs prepares a meal that becomes a feast for ninety people "who ate so well, and laughed so much, it made them angry" (144). Ironically, in the act of providing the community with abundance, Baby Suggs incurs disapproval and disregard from her friends and neighbors. Individuals who had previously embraced Baby Suggs' offerings of community goodwill suddenly become "angry at her because she ha[s] overstepped, given too much, offended them by excess" (145). The stench of disapproval signals the impending loss of community, and Baby Suggs notes "behind the disapproving odor, way way back behind it, she smell[s] another thing. Dark and coming" (146). This impending darkness, though indistinguishable in current narrative context, foretells the violence and community isolation that is forthcoming for Sethe and Denver.

After the institutional forces of slavery invade and Sethe commits "the Misery," the house at 124 hardens, and Sethe and her family endure resentment and shunning by the African American community. As a result of the visit of the four horsemen from Sweet Home and their

attempt to return Sethe and Denver to the shackles of slavery, the house at 124 transforms into a horrific landscape, becoming inescapable and unapproachable by the community, "isolated from the outside and constricted from the inside" (Jesser 13). Sethe, refusing to allow her children to return to the oppression of slavery, is ostracized for her violent act and is forced to live within a "fixed, timeless world trapped on the border of death" (Jesser 13). As a result of Sethe and Denver's displacement from the community, 124 is "shut down and put up with the venom of its ghost. No more lamp all night long, or neighbors dropping by. No [more] low conversations after supper" (94).

Sethe and Denver endure not only a separation from the community but also a displacement from their home. Similar to the Sweet Home plantation, ambiguity resides in the definition of 124 as home, and again *Beloved* illustrates how people's feelings toward a place can be painfully contradictory. According to Leonard Lutwack in *The Role of Place in Literature*, "the character of a place is conditioned by the kind of human activity that is performed there" (47). For twenty-eight days, Sethe and Denver appreciate the freedom of unslaved life and the joys "of healing, ease, and real talk" (100). 124 becomes a place of happiness and comfort, and in contrast to Sweet Home, the landscape of 124 is idealized, "a pause in movement [where Sethe] is cared for and made well" (Yi-Fu Tuan 138). Unfortunately after Sethe commits "the Misery" and she and Denver are uprooted and taken to prison, those "twenty-eight happy days [at 124 are] followed by eighteen years of disapproval and a solitary life" (181).

Sethe and Denver's time in jail detaches them from 124, yet as significant as their physical displacement is the emotional displacement that occurs as a result of Sethe's violent actions. The house on 124 Bluestone Road becomes "spiteful [and] full of baby's venom [with] [...] Sethe and her daughter Denver its only victims" (1). Haunted by Sethe's baby girl's ghost, 124 is regarded "as a person rather than a structure. A person that wept, sighed, trembled, and fell into fits" (31). With the arrival of *Beloved*, the emotional and physical isolation of 124 is confirmed. There is at first "a fusion of all three" characters, and as the relationship between *Beloved* and Sethe intensifies, Denver becomes emotionally displaced from 124 as "*Beloved* lays claim to Sethe" (Jesser 16). Denver, as discussed later, is literally displaced from 124, forced to seek assistance from the outside world.

As a novel directed by such geographic and communal uprootedness, *Beloved* illustrates the "fundamental loss of self that results from the inability to place oneself" (Leake 120). For Baby Suggs and Sethe, the duality of Sweet Home as both home and hell creates the inability of each character to construct a version of her true self. The ambiguity of their feelings toward Sweet Home coupled with the life under Schoolteacher's rule results in a detachment from place that affords Sethe and Denver neither the ability to conceive a true home nor the opportunity to formulate an authentic self. The lives of slaves are predefined by the slave master,

and Baby Suggs describes her experience at Sweet Home as the "desolated center where the self that was no self made its home" (147). For Baby Suggs and Sethe, Sweet Home is a home of pure necessity. The reality of their circumstance is that life on a slave plantation results in a loss of self by displacing the slaves from both their African homeland and the larger black community.

The loss of self is further related to the detachment from place and from one's memory, as evidenced through Denver's struggle with Nelson Lord. Seven-year-old Denver, who briefly attends school under the instruction of Lady Jones, learns to read and write and consequently experiences a taste of the white world's freedom. Denver revels in her position as student, making great "effort to handle chalk expertly and [to] avoid the scream it would make; the capital *w*, the little *i*, the beauty of the letters of her name" (108). Nelson Lord, a classmate of Denver, questions Sethe's violent history, and though Denver has no recollection of these violent events, Nelson Lord's inquiry brings forth a repressed memory involving her past circumstance.

Within the context of Denver's educational pursuit, Morrison references the capital *w* of the white world and the little *i* of the African American identity. As a seven-year-old child, Denver is much too young to remember "the Misery" of her mother's grievous past. Yet by referencing the little *i* within the context of the capital *W* "white world," Morrison signals the oppressive nature of slavery and the hardships Sethe has faced since prison. Forced to live under the white man's oppression, Sethe and Denver lack even the support of their own African American community. The little *i* signifies Denver and Sethe's lack of a true, culturally specific identity.

Equally important is the idea that Denver, even at a young age, represses the memory of her past, and it is through Nelson Lord that she subconsciously realizes her displacement from prison and the symbolic sense of community formed there. Because of Nelson Lord, "the thing that leapt up in her when he asked [...] was a thing that had been lying there all along" (108). Young Denver recognizes, but not necessarily understands, the notion of displacement and lack of self, as a result of the loss of community and the absence of memory.

By presenting the struggle of displacement from home and community, *Beloved* illustrates the necessity of formulating a self within the context of a culturally defined community. Actions in the present are tied to actions in the past, and attempts to forget "unwritten history [...] both personal and cultural, ha[ve] the power to entrap and to enslave" (Hinson 164). Through a process of reestablishing communal ties and reincorporating the past into one's present life story, a definition of self is formed and a culturally specific identity is adopted.

Morrison's references to the death and despair of the slaves coupled with the displacement from their West African homeland remind the reader that the hardships of Sethe and her family are directly tied to the

past and its horrific landscape. African Americans transported during the Middle Passage were displaced and disoriented, "removed from the indigenous land and culture; denied their African names, rituals, and kinship; and reduced to quantities and commodities instead of being subjects" (Holden-Kirwan 424).

Displaced and defined by white people, *Beloved* suggests that African Americans will continue to "transform their houses, their communities, and their minds into safe, open spaces" so that regardless of displacement from their homeland, slaves can assert their authority and reconstruct their self (Jesser 14). Such reconstruction of self occurs for Baby Suggs as a result of her displacement from Sweet Home. By relocating to 124 Bluestone Road, Baby Suggs is afforded the freedom and ability to regain authority over her circumstance. She at once recognizes her heart beating for the first time, and in release from slavery, Baby Suggs draws her first breath no longer as one of the defined. She takes pleasure in achieving ownership over her own body, noting "with a clarity as simple as it [is] dazzling, 'these hands belong to me. These are my hands'" (148). Though life at 124 eventually becomes unbearable following "the Misery," Baby Suggs' time spent as a freed slave functions to reassemble her fragments of self and come to terms with the suffering of her past.

Similar to Baby Suggs, Sethe and Denver are able to reclaim their self despite "a colonially defined and internalized isolation, fear, or [...] pride only with the support of others who also have experienced oppression" (Elliott 182). By reintegrating the traumatic knowledge of their past and reestablishing their self, Sethe and Denver reform ties with the black community and are able to reconstruct a culturally specific identity. Notably, Denver dissolves the boundary between 124 and the surrounding community through her determination to reclaim her self. For Denver, 124 is both home and hell, and when her circumstance proves unbearable, Denver realizes that "not to risk her own apocalyptic moment of resistance to a repeating past is to risk losing her mother and eventually herself" (Jesser 16). With her mother's emaciated body consumed by *Beloved's* growing strength, Denver elects to go "out there where there were places in which things so bad had happened that when you went near them it would happen again. Like Sweet Home where time didn't pass and where, like her mother said, the bad [is] waiting for her as well" (256).

By resolving to "know it and go out in the yard," Denver reintegrates her family into the larger community by beseeching the assistance of the outside world (257). Regardless of the separation between 124 and the outside world, the black community, in an action indicative of African American custom, concedes to assist their own and remedy the situation at 124. Through the assistance of the surrounding community, the "effects of an oppressive discourse on Sethe's life" are absolved, and Sethe and Denver are once again linked "to the community and to the potential to develop subjectivity" (Elliott 194).

Through her efforts to reintegrate 124 into community life, Denver is able to formulate her authentic self. With the responsibility of saving her mother and the knowledge that displacement from the community would ultimately ruin her family, Denver realizes the significance of "having a self to look out for and preserve" (265). Through the process of saving her family, Denver is no longer emotionally displaced from 124 and the African American community and is able to construct her real self.

With reintegration into the community, Sethe and her family no longer must endure the "day's serious work of beating back the past," and consequently they realize that the system of slavery must be dealt with in the present so that those affected by its evils can cope and move forward in their lives (77). Through Denver's efforts, Sethe and her family embrace the past rather than trying to suppress it, and they are able to reclaim their lives and their position in the community. Sethe and Denver recognize that the "crisis within 124 and the community surrounding 124 demonstrates how [...] the past usurps the present and how the persistence of the past disrupts Sethe's and the community's growth and struggles for harmony" (Hinson 156). They cannot return to 124 during the days of Baby Suggs, as such a place no longer exists. They can, however, use the past to tell their own story, affording the freedom and will to establish an identity within a culturally defined community.

For Sethe and Denver (and Paul D. to some extent), resolution with their circumstance is hybrid, as it integrates their past hardships with the present, a process which places them and allows the reconstruction of their true self. Further, in recovering their story, Sethe and her family are able to establish a culturally specific identity within the African American community. By acknowledging and embracing the hardships of their past, each character is reassimilated into the community, and consequently Sethe is able to recognize that "her story [is] bearable because it [is] [Paul D.'s] as well—to tell, to refine and tell again" (104). By telling her story, Sethe "at 124 [...] along with the others [...] had claimed herself [for] freeing yourself was one thing; claiming ownership of that freed self was another" (100).

Beloved aptly demonstrates that "the key to sustenance is in links to others, to communities" (Jesser 3). Sethe and Denver reclaim their life and the story of their past and are able to resolve their life within the context of a culturally specific community. The larger story of slavery and racial suffering is channeled, and referencing the past not only "heals the individual [...] it creates a community" (Clayton 389). Sethe and her family are no longer detached from their history, and in their process of healing, the fluidity between boundaries of home and community is restored. Reestablishing their ties to the African American community, Sethe and Denver are no longer displaced and are ultimately able to achieve a self and a culturally specific identity.

Similar to *Beloved*, Silko's *Ceremony* demonstrates how displacement from one's community parallels a loss of self and a loss of culturally spe-

cific identity. Tayo is separated from the Laguna Pueblo way of life, and as a result of his alienation from tribal living, he must reestablish his connection to Laguna tradition and storytelling. Consistent with tribal view, "people and place are inseparable," and it is the connection to the physical landscape which shapes an individual's self and identity (Erdrich 34). With no ties to the land, an individual lacks a "sense of group and family history" and thus is "helpless without [the earth's] protective embrace" (Erdrich 34, 44).

As a result of interference by white culture, Laguna Pueblo Indians have become displaced from their own territory. According to Silko, "When I was writing *Ceremony* I was so terribly devastated by being taken away from the Laguna country that the writing was my way of re-making that place, the Laguna country, for myself" (Nelson 11). As an author, she relates her own identity with the land, and through the process of writing the story of *Ceremony*, she is able to reestablish her tribal identity through the physical landscape. For Silko and other Native Americans, the physical landscape "provides [...] a referential framework that [...] is] the basis for recentering of [one's] self-consciousness" and the construction of a viable identity (Nelson 6). Without the connection to the physical landscape, an individual is capable of formulating neither an individual nor cultural identity.

Ceremony depicts a world ordered according to place, and though the white man is responsible for much of the uprootedness of the Laguna people, "the desire is strong to make things right, to take back what was stolen and to stop them from destroying what they have taken" (Silko 127-8). Historically a displaced people, Native Americans struggle to maintain their connections to the land while the dominant white culture attempts to appropriate Indian territory. Indians "wake up every morning of their lives to see the land which was stolen, still there, within reach, its theft being flaunted" (127). As a result of the tribal value of place, *Ceremony* is centered on Tayo's journey, in which he "crosses the borders of reservation (Laguna), national forest (Mt. Taylor) and municipality (Gallup)" (Piper 8). Though the land is now fragmented due to federal government zoning, as Tayo advances across each boundary, he reestablishes the "pattern of his people, which once united this territory" (Piper 8).

As a soldier on the Pacific front during the Second World War, Tayo is displaced from home and community. In the midst of battle, Tayo's brother Rocky recognizes Tayo's longing for home, citing "Hey, I know you're homesick. But, Tayo, we're *supposed* to be here. This is what we're supposed to do" (8). Tayo's displacement is one of necessity, yet it is evident that Tayo suffers "a distance as deep as it [is] empty" (Erdrich 35). The reality of Tayo's circumstance is that war creates a false sense of community. Out of necessity, soldiers construct a unified front against the enemy, but any sense of community to which Tayo belongs is limited to the length of his military service.

During his service, Tayo survives terrifying experiences and painful loss including the death of Rocky. Upon release from a prisoner of war camp, Tayo returns home "shell-shocked, disconnected, and terrified" (Beidler 115). Admitted to a Veteran's Administration psychiatric hospital in Los Angeles, Tayo is treated for posttraumatic stress disorder. Though his psychological condition is far from stable, he is ultimately discharged from hospital care and returns home to the Laguna Pueblo reservation in New Mexico. Exposed to white warfare and a world in which the white man's mentality is expected to be his own, Tayo struggles to deal with a culturally and communally estranged existence. To restore his health, Tayo must not only reintegrate himself into the Laguna tribal community, but he must also come to terms with his mixed breed status.

According to Paula Gunn Allen in *The Sacred Hoop*, Tayo's sickness is the direct result of his separation from the land, his people, and his Native American ceremonies (119). Suffering the loss of his community and the distancing from his Pueblo Indian culture, Tayo becomes acutely aware of the "thick white skin that had enclosed him, silencing the sensations of living, the love as well as the grief, and he had been left with only the hum of the tissues that enclosed him" (229). His "thick white skin" represents his tie to white culture, and it is this outward appearance that "wraps itself around [his] Indian identity" (Piper 5). As a Laguna-Pueblo Mexican returning from war, Tayo lacks a true sense of community and struggles with the absence of an individual and cultural identity.

Disconnected from the land and his community, Tayo struggles with the lack of an authentic self. As a Native American of mixed heritage, he encounters cultural pressure from both the Laguna Pueblo and white communities. As a result of his psychological instability and his failure to adapt in his role as half-breed, Tayo suffers a displaced self, unable to formulate an identity specific to a single cultural community. In addition to his struggle with his status as a "half-breed," Tayo's lack of a true self is illustrated through his post-war depression. Upon returning home from the service, Tayo is immediately transported to a hospital, where within the confines of the white community, he lacks a definite form. Tayo suffers post-traumatic depression, and Silko maintains "for a long time [Tayo] had been white smoke. He did not realize [this] until he left the hospital, because white smoke had no consciousness of itself. It faded into the white world of their bed sheets and walls" (14). His white smoke persona signifies his dispersed, drifting form, unable to establish a bond to any one group of people. Within the context of both the Laguna and white communities, Tayo possesses neither a consciousness of self nor the formation of an individual or cultural identity.

Tayo's lack of true self is further illustrated in his feelings of invisibility. He is disconnected from himself, uncomfortable within the confines of the white community. Like the aforementioned white smoke, Tayo's feelings of invisibility leave him shapeless and without direction. While undergoing psychiatric evaluation in the hospital, Tayo's doctor

"asked him if he had ever been visible, and Tayo spoke to him softly and said that he was sorry but nobody was allowed to speak to an invisible one" (15). Tayo is disjointed from the outside world, and consequently does not realize he is speaking; he only "heard a voice answering the doctor. The voice was saying, 'He can't talk to you. He is invisible. His words are formed with an invisible tongue. The have no sound'" (15).

Tayo's separation from the land and lack of a true self is also demonstrated is his displacement from the tribal connection to the Earth. This is best demonstrated during his war service in which he "damned the rain until the words were a chant...[giving] him strength" (12). For the following six years, the land is dry, and Tayo is convinced he is responsible. In this respect, the dryness of the land parallels his dryness of soul. Tayo lacks balance, and in order to reclaim his self, Tayo must reconnect with the Earth, his community, and his mixed status.

"Shell shocked" from his experience in the war, Tayo endeavors to heal his condition through his journey through native landscape. He realizes he must embrace Native American rituals in order to heal his condition, the deterioration of the physical landscape, and the dissolution of his community" (Gunn 123). In order to be reintegrated into the Laguna Pueblo community, Tayo becomes the narrator of his story while simultaneously embracing his status in the tribe and the traditions of his people. Thus Tayo's journey "embraces the patterns and land perceptions of the old people. Walking [for Tayo] functions as its own form of writing [...] Tayo's walk is a remembering, a self-remembering, and a place-remembering" (Piper 8).

Tayo's reconstruction of self occurs during his experience in the uranium pit in which he, while hidden behind a giant boulder, observes Emo, Leroy, and Pinkie torturing Harley to death. Here Tayo surveys the stars overhead, noting "The stars had always been with them, existing beyond memory, and they were all held together there [...] The story goes on with these stars" (254). Tayo understands that existence is part of a much larger story, and through this realization, he is able to "reach a greater awareness of himself and his role in life" (Goldstein 245). Tayo achieves this self-actualization by reestablishing his connection with nature and the tribal art of storytelling.

Through his communication with Betonie, the medicine man, and his development as storyteller, Tayo enters the sphere of Native American thinking and dwelling. Reestablishing his ties to the Laguna Pueblo community, Tayo performs a healing ceremony to incorporate the plethora of cultures which the Pueblo Indians have come into contact. Differing cultures, including the white world, are brought together, and Tayo accepts both his native and nonnative status. As a result of the ceremony, Tayo is able form a version of his authentic self, and still maintain his ties to the Laguna people. Through this process, Tayo is reminded of the illusions of the whites; according to Betonie, white men only "fool themselves when they think [the land] is theirs. The deeds and papers don't mean any-

thing. It is the people who belong to the mountain" (128). Tayo's ceremonial healing marks his reintegration into the Pueblo culture while coming to terms with his connection with the white world.

Through his journey home, Tayo realizes the importance of the stories and myths of his culture. They serve to map out his own existence, and at the same time afford Tayo the ability to recreate himself and embrace Laguna Pueblo history and tradition. Ellen Arnold aptly comments on Tayo's experience: "In re-membering himself, Tayo has [...] been recognized and reclaimed by earth and by his community [...] [H]is body provides a site for the emergence of the stories from mythic into historical time, and Laguna and its oral tradition are recreated through his experience" (Arnold 75). Tayo reestablishes his tribal center, and upon return to the Laguna tribe, he recounts his experience to the tribal elders, consequently becoming a storyteller and author of his own myth. It is here that "[Tayo] cried the relief he felt at finally seeing the pattern, the way all the stories fit together—the old stories, the war stories, their stories—to become the story that was still being told" (246).

Ceremony maintains the world, environment, and relationships among people cannot be healed without the formation of a global perspective. The process of storytelling within the Laguna culture "bind[s] people—and the world—together as a means of preserving life, for if stasis is death so is the atomization or dissolution of the community" (Piper 2). Through his experience at the mine, his involvement in Laguna Pueblo ceremonies, and his recount of his journey to his tribe, Tayo is reintegrated into the tribal community, thereby creating a culturally specific identity. By learning that "he is a part of the tribe, the land, the old rituals, and the universe," Tayo restores hohzo or balance to his culture (Goldstein 246). Regardless of the drought, there is the implication that it will rain both literally and figuratively, and his dryness of soul is no more. Tayo has come to terms with his mixed heritage; his transformation is complete.

Both *Beloved* and *Ceremony* illustrate the loss of individual and cultural identities as a result of displacement from one's community and/or home environment. Though the landscape of *Beloved* ultimately proves more horrific than that of *Ceremony*, both novels clearly illustrate the need to be rooted in a culturally specific place. Human beings "cannot escape [the] need for reference, identity, or [the] pull to landscapes that mirror our most intense feeling" (Erdrich 44). One's identity and notion of self is integral to human experience. As minority writers, both Morrison and Silko skillfully employ the art of storytelling to secure the formation of self and the reintegration of their characters into community life.

Works Cited

- Allen, Paula Gunn. *The Sacred Hoop*. Boston: Beacon, 1992.
- Arnold, Ellen L. "An Ear for the Story, an Eye for the Pattern: Rereading *Ceremony*." *Modern Fiction Studies* 45.1 (1999): 69-92.
- Beidler, Peter G. "The Earth Itself Was Sobbing: Madness and the Environment in Novels by Leslie Marmon Silko and Louise Erdrich." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 26.3 (2002): 113-24.
- Clayton, Jay. "The Narrative Turn in Recent Minority Fiction." *American Literary History* 2.3 (1990): 375-93.
- Elliot, Jane Suero. "Postcolonial Experience in a Domestic Context: Commodified Subjectivity in Toni Morrison's *Beloved*." *Melus* 25.3 (2000): 181-202.
- Erdrich, Louise. "Writers Sense of Place." *A Place of Sense*. Ed. Michael Martone. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1988.
- Goldstein, Susan Coleman. "Silko's *Ceremony*." *The Explicator* 61.4 (2003): 245-46.
- Hinson, Scott D. "Narrative and Community Crisis in *Beloved*." *Melus* 26.4 (2001): 147-7.
- Hilden-Kirwan, Jennifer L. "Looking into the Self that Is No Self: An Examination of Subjectivity in *Beloved*." *African American Review* 32.3 (1998): 415-27.
- Jesser, Nancy. "Violence, Home, and Community." *African American Review* 33.2 (1999): 1-24.
- Leake, Katherine. "Morrison's *Beloved*." *The Explicator* 53.2 (1995): 120-3.
- Lutwack, Leonard. *The Role of Place in Literature*. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1984.
- Morrison, Toni. *Beloved*. New York: A Plume Book, 1988.
- Nelson, Robert M. *Place and Vision: The Function of Landscape in Native American Fiction*. New York: Peter Lang 1993.
- Piper, Karen. "Police Zones: Territory and Identity in Leslie Marmon Silko's *Ceremony*." *American Indian Quarterly* 21.3 (1998): 483-97.
- Silko, Leslie Marmon. *Ceremony*. New York: Penguin Books 1977.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977.

Black Elk Speaks: Lakota or Legend?

Cari Beth Penn

"Throughout the thirties, forties, and fifties, John G. Neihardt's *Black Elk Speaks* drew a steady and devoted readership and served as a reliable expression of the substance that undergirded Plains Indian...beliefs" (Deloria xii). However, despite the veneration Neihardt's work receives, some scholars continue to question the true 'reliability' of its message. Examining the transcripts of Neihardt's original interviews with Lakota medicine man Black Elk – focusing specifically on the Battle of Wounded Knee – reveals contrasts in several areas with the published work, evidence of Neihardt's overt influence. As stated by Vine Deloria, a leading Lakota author, "Present debates center on the question of Neihardt's literary intrusions into Black Elk's system of beliefs and some scholars have said that the book reflects more of Neihardt than it does of Black Elk" (xiv). By omitting passages featuring European or Christian references, Neihardt attempts to 'Indianize' his subject, while at the same time rewording much of the narrative to portray a man more familiar with the nuances of the English language than most Americans. Through supplemental information and undue emphasis on certain of Black Elk's statements, Neihardt promotes the image of the 'vanishing Indian' and the 'noble savage,' and often misrepresents the medicine man's true feelings and depth of personality. In the case of *Black Elk Speaks*, one begins to wonder whose the voice truly is: Black Elk's or Neihardt's?

The Noble Savage

In late 1930, after a brief meeting with an elderly Lakota holy man on the Pine Ridge Indian reservation in South Dakota, John G. Neihardt writes to his publisher of his ambition to write "a book truly *Indian* from the inside out" (H. Neihardt 18). Two years later, Neihardt publishes *Black Elk Speaks* in fulfillment of his goal. This 'truly Indian' work is, however, not wholly the product of Neihardt's Lakota source, because, unfortunately for the author, Black Elk himself is a socially and religiously complex figure, and not homogeneously 'Indian.'

Neihardt's romanticized views of Native American culture and ritual inspire him to write about a people shrouded in mysticism and savage nobility. He wants to pen a legend, not a history of the Lakota. In order to do so, he must first create a hero – the Lakota medicine man Black Elk, who is warrior, hunter, and holy man rolled into one figure. But Black Elk the man is much more complicated than Neihardt's 'noble savage,' and does not fit the author's stereotype. Consequently, Neihardt 'tweaks' Black Elk's narrative to mold a man who has lived in and adapted to nearly 67 years of tumultuous history (1863 – 1930) into the prototypical "noble savage," complete with feathered headdress and war paint.

Neihardt's most noticeable alteration of the narrative lies in the omission of most, if not all Christian and/or European references made by Black Elk. Phrases such as "Promised Land" (DeMallie 268) are exchanged for less culturally – and Biblically – charged terms, in this case "Other World" (J. Neihardt 251). The author omits more overtly Christian remarks all together (DeMallie 263 and J. Neihardt 245). Joseph Epes Brown, another of Black Elk's co-authors (*The Sacred Pipe: Black Elk's Account of the Seven Rites of the Oglala Sioux*) posits a likely explanation for Neihardt's omissions: "I suppose somehow it was thought this Christian participation compromised his 'Indianness'..." (qtd. in Steltenkamp xx). In order to paint a "purely Indian" picture of Black Elk, Neihardt simply ignores the holy man's dual identity as both Lakota medicine man and Catholic catechist.

Vanishing Indians

The second major stereotype promoted by Neihardt in *Black Elk Speaks* concerns the 'vanishing Indian' figure. Through his selective presentation of Black Elk's narrative, Neihardt portrays the Lakota tribe at the Battle of Wounded Knee as "pitiful and in despair" (J. Neihardt 231), a beaten, even dying people. While Black Elk himself does admit to the sad physical state of his tribe – "...they all looked pitiful" (DeMallie 256) – he fails to describe their mental state. Here, Neihardt equates the physical stresses of malnutrition and exposure with a defeatist mental attitude, an attitude that Black Elk never suggests. Throughout the chapters concerning Wounded Knee, Neihardt continually emphasizes the harsh conditions endured by the Lakota. According to one such account, the tribes "had all run away to hide in the Badlands, and they were coming in now because they were starving and freezing" (J. Neihardt 253). Interestingly, Black Elk fails to include such negative descriptions, which counteracts Neihardt's picture of a weak group composed of 'poor pitiful women and children'.

Similar alterations on Neihardt's part accentuate the "vanishing Indian" image by portraying the Lakota people as already beaten, contrary to the actual words of Black Elk. For example, Neihardt describes an 1889 treaty between the United States government and the Sioux people as a defeat – "...when he [General George Crook] came this time without any soldiers, he whipped us and drove us back" (J. Neihardt 231) – whereas Black Elk does not display this fatalistic mind-set.

Throughout his narration, Black Elk presents a picture of a calm, stoic figure, who simply relates the events of his life, most often without bias. He 'sticks to the facts' without dramatizing the bad or the good. In contrast, Neihardt's work constantly indulges in melodramatic descriptions of starving tribespeople, "butchered women and children and babies" (J. Neihardt 262), and ruthless white soldiers. Such passages overemphasize the dismal circumstances surrounding Wounded Knee, and suggest a Lakota attitude of hopelessness and helplessness which

conflicts with Black Elk's 'life goes on' outlook. This pattern of editing is most strikingly demonstrated in the closing paragraphs of Neihardt's *Black Elk Speaks*, where Neihardt quotes Black Elk's moving farewell at the time of the Lakota surrender at Wounded Knee:

And so it was all over. I did not know then how much was ended...And I can see that something else died there in the bloody mud, and was buried in the blizzard. A people's dream died there. It was a beautiful dream... There is no center any longer, and the sacred tree is dead (J. Neihardt 270).

What makes this statement so surprising is that Black Elk did not say it. These often-quoted final words of *Black Elk Speaks* were not spoken by Black Elk, but by Neihardt – yet another example of over dramatization in the portrayal of the Lakota 'defeat'. In stark contrast to Neihardt's dismal pronouncement, Black Elk ends his dictation with, "Two years later I was married" (DeMallie 282). With this simple statement, Black Elk demonstrates the persevering nature of his people. Though one way of life has ended, life itself has not, and the Lakota will go on.

Neihardt's Christian Vision vs. Black Elk's Time Line

As evidence of Neihardt's 'selective editing' techniques promoting the 'vanishing Indian' and 'noble savage' stereotypes within *Black Elk Speaks* continues to build, one vital question remains – why? Why does Neihardt alter the meaning of the Lakota holy man's narrative so drastically as to turn an introspective history into a pronouncement of 'doom and gloom' for the Lakota people? Perhaps more importantly, is this alteration intentionally negative?

Like most Western writers of his time, Neihardt's notion of time is linear and fixed – time goes on in a line, and history does not repeat itself. Traditional Christian beliefs also influence his view of history, and, as Rice states, Neihardt is "a Christian poet in the typological tradition with a strong, consistent view of history as providential progress" (x). In other words, Neihardt firmly believes that progress marches on according to God's foreordained plan. Rice further postulates, "...his [Neihardt's] commonly noted pathos in depicting the vanishing American is strongly theological. In his view, Native Americans had to be crucified for the sake of their own redemption through God's instrument, the 'Aryan' [i.e. Indo-European] race" (xi). Finally, she hypothesizes, "The Lakota suffer [sic.] at Wounded Knee as Christ suffered on the cross, so that a lesser understanding can be transformed to unifying love" (Rice 49). From Neihardt's point of view, the 'defeat' of the Lakota is the culmination of God's plan for their salvation. Salvation comes only through suffering – a popular entertained by late nineteenth and early twentieth century Christians. This being the case, Neihardt does not view the 'vanishing Indian' as detrimental to Native Americans. In fact, he sees the 'end' of traditional culture as the only way for Native peoples to assimilate, convert, and survive.

Problems arise when comparing Neihardt's linear notion of history to the traditional Native American view of time as cyclical and circular – time itself has no end and no beginning, and history repeats itself. Black Elk sees no end to the dream, no breaking of the sacred hoop, for everything that was once will eventually be again. Though for the time being, his people have lost their lands and their power to fight, "life would somehow continue, and on their reservation Black Elk and his people [would] try to live as nearly as they could in the good old ways" (J. Neihardt 76), until the circle completes another cycle, and the 'good old ways' return.

Neihardt combats this optimistic Native American view by molding Black Elk himself into proof for his "providential progress" (Rice x) notion of history. By altering Black Elk's narrative to suit his own needs, Neihardt creates the quintessential 'noble savage' and 'vanishing Indian' figure, an old holy man, one of the last of his people clinging to the old Lakota religion. He erases all traces of Black Elk's familiarity with Christianity and European culture (ironically, Black Elk spent several years in Europe with Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show) to present a 'pure Indian'. In turn, this 'pure Indian' figure provides a valid account of the 'end' of Native American, and specifically Lakota, culture. Because Neihardt portrays Black Elk as a remnant of a pure Indian heritage, readers believe him when he says, "the dream is dead" (J. Neihardt 270), thus completing Neihardt's ultimate purpose – to present Native Americans as a dying society. However, in Neihardt's view, death results in assimilation, conversion to Christianity, and rebirth into a new "American society," full of promise and hope.

Shaky Foundations?

From the time of its first release in 1932, John G. Neihardt's *Black Elk Speaks* has enjoyed both critical and popular acclaim. The novel has been hailed as the "canon or at least the central core of a North American Indian theological canon" (Deloria xiv) – an Indian Bible. Yet, as evidenced by numerous literary scholars (e.g. DeMallie, Rice, and Steltenkamp, among others), *Black Elk Speaks* appears to be more the work of its 'translator' Neihardt than of Black Elk himself. Comparisons with transcripts from Neihardt's original interviews with the Lakota holy man reveal numerous omissions, additions, and rewordings, most of which further Neihardt's stereotype of the 'vanishing Indian' and the 'noble savage'.

Perhaps Neihardt's dreaming simply 'got the best of him.' After a few hours of conversation with Black Elk in 1930, Neihardt left the Pine Ridge Indian reservation with a picture of a holy man of the old tradition, a man who still practiced ancient Lakota rituals, a man who had known the great Sioux warrior Crazy Horse. This, Neihardt might have thought, was a 'true Indian,' untainted by Christianity or popular culture. Here was the chance to write a book "truly *Indian* from the inside out" (H. Neihardt 18). Much to his dismay, however, Neihardt soon discovered the complexity of Black Elk's personality and past – not only a Lakota

warrior, a medicine man, and a hunter, but also a Catholic convert, and a widely traveled performer. How could he base a “truly Indian” story on a man that was not “truly Indian”? In order to write the story of the ‘noble savage’ and the ‘vanishing Indian’ that Neihardt desired, he was forced to alter Black Elk’s narrative, to create a character and a people less Lakota, and more legend.

Works Cited

- Black Elk, Wallace H., and William S. Lyon. *Black Elk: The Sacred Ways of a Lakota*. San Francisco: Harper, 1990.
- Brown, Joseph Epes, ed. *The Sacred Pipe: Black Elk's Account of the Seven Rites of the Oglala Sioux*. The Civilization of the American Indian Series, Vol. 36. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1988.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr., Introduction. *Black Elk Speaks*. By John G. Neihardt. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1972. xi – xiv.
- DeMallie, Raymond J., ed. *The Sixth Grandfather: Black Elk's Teachings Given to John G. Neihardt*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1984.
- Holler, Clyde. *Black Elk's Religion: The Sun Dance and Lakota Catholicism*. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1995.
- Neihardt, Hilda. *Black Elk and Flaming Rainbow: Personal Memories of the Lakota Holy Man and John Neihardt*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1995.
- Neihardt, John G. *Black Elk Speaks*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1972.
- Rice, Julian. *Black Elk's Story: Distinguishing Its Lakota Purpose*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1991.
- Steltenkamp, Michael F. *Black Elk: Holy Man of the Oglala*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1993.

Yeats: His Friends and His Questions

Ashley Pope

John Butler Yeats' greatest gift to his son was an appreciation for the gift of human life. A painter and atheist, he taught William that there is holiness in earthly truth, divines in the imperfections of human kind. So from a very young age, William Butler Yeats came to believe that art is inseparably knotted to life itself; therefore the most successful poet is the one most passionately devoted to his fellow human beings. In response to his father's skepticism, Yeats' work was largely a product of his own uncertainty, asking the questions "what is truth, what is reality, what is man" (Ellemann 298). In search of these answers, Yeats deliberately arranged every aspect of his life and work into a unified, artistic whole. He says, "it is easier to write poetry that is far from life yet it is infinitely more interesting to write poetry that is of life" (Unterecker 10). Because of the unique relationship between artist and creation, Yeats' friends became household names for his readers. The people Yeats was closest to served as his inspiration, subjects, and muses. By examining how Yeats' attitude toward his friends changes throughout his work, we can trace how his personal philosophy evolved over the course of his lifelong pursuit of truth.

Especially in his early poetry, the overwhelming dominant character is Maude. Although her role changes over time, she remains a constant influence and presence in his thoughts and work. In these early poems particularly, Yeats' obsession with Maude is combined with his fascination with the creative process. His parallels and cross-references are so consistent that the two realms become one in the same. In "The Fish," Yeats uses the metaphor of the fish to represent both Maude and the act of writing. To Yeats, the pursuit of love and the pursuit of word choice are equally trying and tedious. His attitude is one of bitterness against her fish-like elusiveness. Such an opinion is best revealed in the lines "The people of coming days will know/About the casting of my net/And think you were hard and unkind/And blame you with many bitter words" (3,4,7,8). While he scolds against her, he seems self-praising of his own patience, artistry, and metaphoric cleverness. Both art and Maude are something to be attained, caught and conquered.

"A Poet to his Beloved" is another Maude poem that proves that the young Yeats does not really appreciate his closest friends as real people but as creative subjects. Again Maude and poetry are undeniably linked, for in this poem Maude fulfills her role as Yeats' subject, inspiration, and patron. He portrays her, not as a human but as an idealized, unattainable perfection. In the lines, "White woman with numberless dreams/I bring you my passionate rhyme" Yeats seems to offer his poetry to no one less than a Goddess (7,8). So in his early works, his friends do have a role in

his poetry, but their personalities are frequently distorted to fit his artistic need.

His entire life Yeats battles with a simultaneous desire to live in reality and the imagination. At first he seems relatively content to concentrate on his poetry. By middle age, however, Maude has married and Yeats himself becomes increasingly aware of his lack of human companionship. He expresses this heightened awareness throughout the collection *Responsibilities* in such poems as "Beggar to Beggar." Almost in a panic, Yeats writes, "'And Get a comfortable wife and house/To rid me of the devil in my shoes,'/ Beggar to beggar cried being frenzy struck/ 'And the worse devil that is between my thighs'" (5-8). The opening poem in *Responsibilities* questions the worth of poetic legacy verses the importance of actual descendents. He closes the poem with the lines, "Although I have come close on forty-nine/ I have no child, I have nothing but a book/ Nothing but that to prove your blood and mine" (20-22). While he acknowledges that something is lacking in his life, a knowledgeable Yeats reader can easily pick up on his sarcasm. In this poem he belittles the value of a book, but such a remark is contrary to his usual praise for the supreme intellect, artistry, and power of words. Yeats' underlying bitter statement is this: yes I lack a family and yes I want one. The art I have achieved on my own, however, is far more lasting and impacting than human company.

The death of Yeats' young friend, Robert Gregory shocked the poet into a heightened awareness of the frailty of life, raising new questions and resurrecting the same old insecurities. The piece "In Memory of Robert Gregory" is both an elegy and a séance. In the poem he calls back to life four departed friends, yet Yeats seems quite removed and emotionally neutral to the return of the first three. Stanzas III-V are unsentimental overviews of each of their professional lives, mentioning only the most basic of personality traits. Yeats seems much more deeply affected by the death of the fourth friend, Robert Gregory. The remainder of the poem is consumed by an idealized elegy to the young man. The unrealistic description of him is similar to Yeats' early portrayals of Maude. There does not seem to be anything Robert can't do: "Soldier, scholar, horseman, he/As 'twere all life's epitome" (86,87). Yeats examines all the youth's accomplishments, and in turn reflects on his own achievement. He praises Gregory as the perfection of action, passion and life. He is the embodiment of everything that Yeats himself is not. In a sense, Robert is Yeats' mask. While he is troubled by his friend's untimely death, the poem is too idealized to hold much sincerity. More than grief, Gregory's death fills Yeats with doubt about the quality and achievement of his own life.

After Yeats marries, his poetry becomes more grounded and his theme becomes narrower. It is odd. As George opens the door to the spirits Yeats' poetry becomes more natural. The more he ages, the deeper his appreciation for all human life. Yeats' contact with the spirit world and his own decreasing health cause him to focus more and more on the subject of aging and the

purpose of life. It is as if the dead and the spirit world confirm something for Yeats about the living. His poetry begins to show a growing consciousness of those closest to him. Some of his earliest poetry is directed towards his literary and Irish descendents. Now poems like "A Prayer for my Daughter" and "A Prayer for my Son" show a new concern for the future of his own children. Comparatively, as the death count of Yeats' friends increase, his deceased companions also take an increased role in his poetry. "All Soul's Night" is a séance poem calling his occult friends from the grave to share with them *A Vision*. "Coole Park 1929" is one of Yeats' first truly reminiscent poems as he assembles five literary friends of his youth at the home of Lady Gregory to honor the estate and its owner. He acknowledges the role Lady Gregory played not only in his art but in his life. He says later "I doubt I should have done as much with my life but for her firmness and care." (Unterecker 15). This is a very different poem than the earlier one in memory of her son. Here, Yeats praises Lady Gregory, but he does so realistically. He appreciates her as a person not as an idol.

To examine Yeats' stylistic changes it is interesting to compare "The Municipal Gallery Revisited" to an earlier poem, "To a Wealthy Man who Promised a Second Subscription to the Dublin Municipal Gallery if it were Proved the People Wanted Pictures." The earlier poem is purely a criticism of the Irishmen's lack of support for the arts. For young Yeats, there was "only one valuable class, that of the artist. They alone... could make a permanent contribution to civilization" (121 Unterecker). In the first poem, Yeats seems to exalt or to isolate himself. Now, in his old age, Yeats stands in the gallery surrounded by portraits of his friends and fellow writers, many of whom are now dead. This poem is not a criticism, but also a reflection. For the first time we see Yeats physically brought to his knees, emotionally overwhelmed with grief and gratitude for the people that he loves. Yeats looks around with the lines, "Heart smitten with emotion I sink down/My heart recovering with covered eyes (16,17). He asks the reader to look beyond the final product of his poetry and remember the portraits in this gallery. As much pride as he takes in his work, in the last stanza he admits to cherishing these people even more than poetry: "Think where man's glory most begins and ends/And say my glory was I had such friends" (54, 55).

I think that it is important that Yeats wished to close his life with such a simple poem as "Politics." It was written at the very end of his life, during a time of international turmoil and personal physical suffering. The message, however, is one of hope. Yeats acknowledges the reality of conflict and pain, yet thoughts of love overshadow every worry and uneasiness. He ends as if with a sigh, "But O that I was young again/And held her in my arms" (10, 11).

What did he mean by departing with these lines? For certainly he had a reason. Yeats was very deliberate about the order of his poems, the coherence of his speeches, essays, letters, and autobiography. Every aspect of his being worked together creating a purposeful, artistic unity.

His entire life was consumed by an unquenchable thirst for truth, purpose, and reality. The author of "Politics," however, does not seem haunted by restlessness or even care that there are still unanswered questions. Yeats seems both at peace with the conflict within himself and in his world. Relieved of doubt, Yeats appears content to be lost in the sweet treasure of memory.

The poet's questions drug him through the depths of religion-all forms, politics, history, philosophy, science, and finally through the world of the spirits. After all that, does Yeats mean to say that life's meaning was in front of him the whole time, in the relationships of friends and family? Did love bring Yeats the purpose and peace that he so needed? The trend of his subject matter and themes would imply yes- yes it did.

And I would certainly like to think so.

Works Cited

- Ellemann, Richard. *Yeats: the Man and the Masks*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1948.
- Unterecker, John. *A Reader's Guide to William Butler Yeats*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1959.
- Yeats, William Butler. *The Collected Poems of W.B. Yeats*. 2nd ed. Ed. Richard J. Finneran. New York: Simon & Schuster Inc, 1989.

Effects of Western Contact on Native Hawaiians

Wesley Gannon Kelley

Scarcely more than fifty percent of Native Hawaiians, ages eighteen through twenty-four, have completed the equivalent of high school (*Reconciliation*, sec. "Education"). In addition, nearly half of Native Hawaiians suffer housing-related troubles, a higher percentage than even the Native Americans (DOI and DOJ 48). According to a report by the Hawaii Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights, the blame for housing problems rests squarely on the shoulders of the Federal Government (*Broken Trust* 43). The economic hardships of this minority are not new phenomena, but continue back even before the annexation of Hawaii by the United States of America. Racial injustice such as this may have caused President Grover Cleveland to say, "Hawaii is ours. As I look back upon the first steps in this miserable business, and as I contemplate the means used to complete the outrage, I am ashamed of the whole affair" (qtd. in *Reconciliation*, sec. "The Past that Haunts").

A number of factors have contributed to the current state of Native Hawaiians. The partnership between expansionists and Kamehameha I resulted in the fall of the Hawaiian nation. Ironically, the kingdom's fall closely resembles the exploitation of Native American tribes on the mainland. Both Native Americans and Native Hawaiians thought that Caucasians would help defeat rival tribes, but the final outcome was the subordination of those native peoples to a foreign power (Pratt and Smith 18). This subordination continues even today, but in the more subtle form of lower socioeconomic statuses, abuse of homeland trusts, and racial tensions. This paper will examine how the West's contact has made the Native Hawaiian people a subordinate minority through two means: depopulation due to disease and the introduction of a capitalist economic structure. The move for reparations in the form of a sovereign Hawaiian state will also be analyzed. However, before examining the "miserable business" of Native Hawaiian hardships, one must explore and understand the origin of the Hawaiian people and their culture before and after the initial contact with the West.

Authors generally agree that the Polynesians first settled the Hawaiian islands (Kirch 161; Nordyke 3-12; Pratt and Smith 17; Tamura 1). However, the term "Polynesians" does not fully disclose the identity of Hawaii's founders. As shown by a map of the Polynesian area, the broad term "Polynesian" describes the many peoples and places of the area (Hiroa iii). Appropriately, the term finds its base in the two Greek words ????? (*polus*) and ????? (*nesos*) which together mean "many islands" (Luschnig 393, 398). Tamura indicates that Marquesian islanders,

a specific sub-group of Polynesians, first reached Hawaii (1). On the other hand, some authors do not mention the Marquesians, but refer to Hawaiian legends that say the Menehune people arrived first (Hiroa 107; Nordyke 7; Taylor 238). Regardless of this discrepancy, Hiroa, Tamura, and Taylor all agree that the Tahitians, another Polynesian group, arrived later and contributed to Hawaii's settlement (107; 1; 238). The settlers reached their new Hawaiian colony by means of long-range canoes and their excellent navigational abilities (Pi'ian?i'a 162; Tamura 1). When traveling, the explorers also introduced their own native plants and animals to their newly discovered lands (Abbott 163). The Tahitian journey to Hawaii covered 2,400 miles (Tamura 1). Peter Bellwood notes the hard conditions endured by Polynesian sailing parties during such journeys and appropriately describes their maritime accomplishments as truly "astounding" (39). The Polynesians used their skills to settle the Hawaiian islands which, by some geographical standards, "are among the most remote on earth" (Pratt and Smith 3).

On these distant islands, the original settlers lived undisturbed for at least 1,500 years. Charles M. Langlas notes that their society blossomed in the areas of government, religion, and agriculture. The chiefs derived their right to rule from the society's complex religious beliefs (169). They ruled their territories and protected their constituents in exchange for labor and goods, much like a feudal system. However, the system was not technically feudal because residents had the freedom to leave their chief's land for another. In the event of the chief's death, the control of the land was usually reorganized (Pratt and Smith 17-8). William A. Simonds indicates that by the time Western explorers discovered Hawaii, the natives had developed clever irrigation methods (9). While the Native Hawaiians may not have made technological advances comparable to those of the West, by the time of their first contact with the West, they were a developed civilization that had endured for centuries in isolation.

Confusion exists over who the first non-Polynesians were that actually first reached the Hawaiian islands. This confusion significantly affects the issue of Western contact, because, as Pratt and Smith suggest, whoever arrived first receives much of the blame for the entire ordeal Native Hawaiians have undergone (18). The British Captain James Cook arrived at the Hawaiian Islands in 1778 (Langlas 169), but Morris claims that the Spanish may have reached Hawaii before that (228). However, Hiroa, who writes more than forty years later, maintains that this idea no longer carries validity, though he does not elaborate further (107). Langlas's article in the *Atlas of Hawai'i*, a more recent publication, does not even mention the possibility of Spanish discovery, but Pratt and Smith, even more recently published, still admit the possibility and even go on to say that Japanese contact could have occurred prior to Cook's (18). In spite of these incongruencies, authors speak of Cook as having a very significant impact on the Hawaiian people (Hiroa 107; Langlas 169-70; Nordyke 16; Tamura 1).

Cook ignited Hawaii's contact with the Western world, but he did not leave a good first impression. The Hawaiians immediately received the English explorers with open arms and began trade (Langlas 170). For a short time, the Hawaiians even considered Cook to be an incarnated deity (Taylor 241). No material consulted has told whether or not Cook played along with the Hawaiians' misperception, but I believe that he did. This would explain why the Hawaiians, who soon realized the Caucasians were not gods, began to squabble and steal from the British explorers (Langlas 170; Taylor 241). The disputes escalated into a full confrontation which resulted in Cook's death at the hands of one vengeful Hawaiian (Taylor 243). After a few final meetings between Cook's party and the Hawaiians, Western contact ceased until 1786 (Langlas 171).

When contact resumed eight years after the fiery first engagement with the West, the Hawaiians had cooled down a bit and wanted to settle into a peaceful relationship with visitors. Tamura explains that the markets for fur, sandalwood, and whaling comprised most of the Western trade interests in the Pacific. Unfortunately, Hawaiians acquired the externalities of alcohol use and prostitution that resulted from the rest stops the traders made in between voyages. Small tribal hamlets like Honolulu had transformed into more Western-like communities by the middle of the nineteenth century (1). Langlas notes that the Hawaiian chiefs developed an affinity towards foreign goods and used them to signify their high position in society (171). Through trade, the relationship between the Hawaiian people and the West had reached the point of inseparability. The die was cast for the Hawaiians. They would now collide head on with the strength of American expansionism well described by Julius W. Pratt as the "New Manifest Destiny" (1).

One of the first problems brought by the Westerners was depopulation due to diseases such as gonorrhea, syphilis, and possibly cholera which sterilized and killed many Hawaiians. The introduction of these new threats devastated the population for about fifty years. The Hawaiians finally began to experience a comeback around the turn into the twentieth century (Langlas 170-1). However, the depopulation controversy exists over how much the native population actually declined between the years 1778-1823. A work by David Stannard entitled *Before the Horror* began the debate by claiming that the Native Hawaiian population at the time of Cook's discovery numbered around 800,000 (55). This estimate greatly exceeds the traditional estimate of around 300,000 (Pratt and Smith 18), and would indicate an even greater tragedy wrought by Cook's party, who realized they were carrying syphilis to Hawaii (Stannard vii). If Stannard hypothesizes correctly, the European diseases whittled the Native Hawaiian numbers down in such a way that they have never truly recovered. Therefore, Native Hawaiians' deplorable status as a minority in their own land can be partially blamed on the devastation of Western diseases introduced through Cook's visit (Schmitt 186).

Capitalism followed on the heels of disease, and spread just as easily. Missionaries-turned-businessmen instilled capitalist ideas in Hawaiians such as the private ownership of land, work ethic, and personal success (Pratt and Smith 19-20). However, J.W. Pratt notes that annexation sentiments did not arise from American business at first. They arose during the time of the Spanish-American War, when businesses tasted the first-fruits of Philippine trade (257, 274). By then, sugar had replaced whaling as the leading Hawaiian industry (Langlas 174). The new sugar industry set the stage for more expansionism in Hawaii, and so the capitalist system that gave the Caucasians prosperity also made Native Hawaiians a poor minority.

A Hawaiian reciprocity treaty with the United States allowed the sugar industry to climb to new heights (Thomas Jones 43), while causing harm to Native Hawaiians at the same time. Claus Spreckels, a businessman dubbed "the Sugar King," capitalized on the industry's growth and possessed considerable power in the Hawaiian Islands (Adler vii). At this point, Langlas notes that Native Hawaiians began to lose the clout they once had, and slowly migrated to jobs as poor laborers on sugar plantations. Imported laborers from China and Japan increased the Islands' total population, and further sealed Hawaiians' fate as an ethnic minority (174-6).

In addition to the sugar industry, pineapple held an important place in Hawaii's economy as well (Brewbaker 239). Production of pineapple centered on plantation-based communities of laborers. Surprisingly, Norbeck states that Native Hawaiians rarely worked on plantations, because corporations deemed the natives unfit for such a lifestyle. This unexplained view of Native Hawaiians undoubtedly carries with it racial prejudices, but perhaps these prejudices worked for their benefit. Many Native Hawaiians moved to urban areas and took more skilled jobs or started entrepreneurial endeavors. Nevertheless, labor importation for the pineapple industry also contributed to Native Hawaiians' minority status (4-5).

The pineapple industry established more business special interest in Hawaiian politics, and crowded out Native Hawaiians' political concerns at the same time. Like Spreckels and the sugar industry, another entrepreneur named James Dole seized the opportunity Hawaii proffered by starting a pineapple business. Incidentally, James Dole was the cousin of Hawaii's territorial governor, Sanford Dole, who "prophesied" that statehood would come (Dole Food Company, Inc. *Timeline*; Fuchs 46). I have found no information stating that the two relatives supported each other in their respective professional fields. However, a pre-statehood article mentions that the pineapple industry supported Hawaii's statehood, so through his cousin, James may have acquired some political clout later on in life ("A Look at the 'State' of Hawaii" 36). Big business pushed the politicians of Hawaii toward the statehood issue, which further "Americanized" the Native Hawaiians (Fuchs 54).

After all the injustices done to the Native Hawaiians through industries such as sugar and pineapple, the Native Hawaiians began to seek reparations. This matter currently faces all Hawaiian citizens as the greatest political issue in the state. Diverse opinions exist as to exactly how reparations should be made. Some call for land and money, while others call for an independent sovereign state. Opinions diverge even in the independence camp; some desire only parts of the islands to be relinquished, while others demand the entire island group (Pratt and Smith 232-6). Ka Lāhui Hawai'i stands as the largest organization favoring an independent state (Langlas 182). Some proponents of Hawaiian independence assert that under the UN provisions in effect at the time of the statehood decision, the United States had no right to move Hawaii towards statehood. Instead, the U.S. should have been considering the will of the indigenous people (Mahalo). Even the state's governor declared in 1998 that all Hawaiian citizens should work together, "to advance a plan for Hawaiian sovereignty" (qtd. in *Governor's State of the State Address*).

However, some claim that Native Hawaiians have no reason to seek reparations. Since political power cannot be inherited, Hawaiians have no moral basis for demanding an independent state (Hanifin). Another accuses Native Hawaiians of separatism and proliferation of false propaganda (Bob Jones). Still another recalls that not all Native Hawaiians under monarchical rule actually supported the original Hawaiian Monarchy (Twigg-Smith 3). The opposition to Hawaiian independence shows the complex political environment in which Native Hawaiians exist.

Since Cook's arrival, the West has affected Native Hawaiians in many ways. Disease has depopulated them, while industry, typically considered a sign of progress, has actually made them a minority in an insecure economic position. In 1993, the United States government issued an official apology, signed by the president, admitting to the sugar industry's overthrow of the Hawaiian government and the invasion of the Hawaiian Kingdom by U.S. forces (*Apology Bill Public Law 103-150*). However, the apology does not end the issue of Hawaiian sovereignty. On the contrary, it only signals that the United States Government has finally entered into the dialogue. Debate over this issue will probably continue for many years until opposing sides reach a compromise.

The effects of Western contact with Native Hawaiians are complex, but the West has certainly made Native Hawaiians a minority in their own land. Unfortunately, the suffering of the Native Hawaiians and the similar experience of the Native Americans demonstrate that the West cannot expand without overrunning the people that stand in its way. Hopefully the U.S. Government will abandon this tendency in the future. Through patiently working with concerned groups, the U.S. Government will prove itself to be a true supporter of democracy. Otherwise, the U.S. Government may harm its self-image by favoring expansionism over restitution for Native Hawaiians.

Works Cited

- Abbott, Isabella A. "Ethnobotany." *Atlas of Hawai'i*. Eds. Sonia P. Juvik and James O. Juvik. 3rd ed. Honolulu: U of Hawai'i P, 1998.
- Adler, Jacob. *Claus Spreckels: The Sugar King in Hawaii*. Honolulu: U of Hawaii P, 1966.
- Bellwood, Peter. *The Polynesians: Prehistory of an Island People*. Rev. ed. London: Thames & Hudson, 1987.
- Brewbaker, Paul H. "Economy." *Atlas of Hawai'i*. Eds. Sonia P. Juvik and James O. Juvik. 3rd ed. Honolulu: U of Hawai'i P, 1998.
- Dole.com: Timeline (1900-1929). Dole Food Company, Inc. 11 May 2003 <<http://www.dole.com/company/about/timeline2.jsp>>.
- Fuchs, Lawrence H. *Hawaii Prono: A Social History*. 1961. Rpt. in *The New States: Alaska and Hawaii*. Ed. William P. Lineberry. New York: H.W. Wilson Company, 1963. 46-57.
- Governor's State of the State Address – comments regarding Hawaiian Sovereignty. 11 May 2003 <<http://www.hawaiin-ation.org/stateofthestate98.html>>.
- Hanifin, Patrick W. "Hawaiian Reparations: Nothing Lost, Nothing Owed". XVII *Hawaii Bar Journal* No. 2. 1982. 11 May 2003 <<http://www.hawaiiimatters.com/hanifin2.pdf>>.
- Hawaii Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Reconciliation at a Crossroads: The Implications of the Apology Resolution and Rice v. Cayetano for Federal and State Programs Benefiting Native Hawaiians*. (2001). 13 Apr. 2003 <<http://www.usccr.gov/pubs/hawaii/report.htm>>.
- . *A Broken Trust: The Hawaiian Homelands Program: Seventy Years of Failure of the Federal and State Governments to Protect the Civil Rights of Native Hawaiians*. (1991): fiche CR 1.2:H 31/3.
- Hiroa, Te Rangi. *An Introduction to Polynesian Anthropology*. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum, 1945.
- Jones, Bob. "Academics Duck Sovereignty Issue." *Midweek*. 17 May 1999. Rpt. in *Hawai'i Matters: Views and Opinions*. 11 May 2003 <http://www.hawaiiimatters.com/views_bjones.html>.
- Jones, Thomas C., ed. *The Hawaii Book: Story of Our Island Paradise*. Chicago: J. G. Ferguson Publishing Company, 1961.
- Kirch, Patrick V. "Archaeology." *Atlas of Hawai'i*. Eds. Sonia P. Juvik and James O. Juvik. 3rd ed. Honolulu: U of Hawai'i P, 1998.
- Langlas, Charles M. "History." *Atlas of Hawai'i*. Eds. Sonia P. Juvik and James O. Juvik. 3rd ed. Honolulu: U of Hawai'i P, 1998.
- "A Look at the 'State' of Hawaii." *United States News & World Report*. 27 Feb. 1953 Rpt. in *Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska*. Ed. Edward Latham. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1953. 35-9.
- Luschnig, C. A. E. *An Introduction to Ancient Greek: A Literary Approach*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975.

- Mahalo. *Is Hawaii Really a State of the Union?*. 11 May 2003 <<http://www.hawaii-nation.org/statehood.html>>.
- Morris, Charles. *Our Island Empire: A Hand-Book of Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands*. Nashville: Publishing House of the M.E. Church South, 1899.
- Norbeck, Edward. *Pineapple Town: Hawaii*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1959.
- Nordyke, Eleanor C. *The Peopling of Hawai'i*. 2nd ed. Honolulu: U of Hawaii P, 1989.
- Pi'ianz'a, Gordon. "Polynesian Navigation." *Atlas of Hawai'i*. Eds. Sonia P. Juvik and James O. Juvik. 3rd ed. Honolulu: U of Hawai'i P, 1998.
- Pratt, Julius W. *Expansionists of 1898: The Acquisition of Hawaii and the Spanish Islands*. New York: John Hopkins P, 1951.
- Pratt, Richard C., and Zachary Smith. *Hawai'i Politics and Government: An American State in a Pacific World*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2000.
- Schmitt, Robert C. "Population." *Atlas of Hawai'i*. Eds. Sonia P. Juvik and James O. Juvik. 3rd ed. Honolulu: U of Hawai'i P, 1998.
- Simonds, William A. *Kamaaina-A Century in Hawaii*. Hawaii: American Factors, 1949.
- Stannard, David E. *Before the Horror: The Population of Hawai'i on the Eve of Western Contact*. Honolulu: U of Hawaii P, 1989.
- Tamura, Eileen H. *Americanization, Acculturation, and Ethnic Identity: The Nisei Generation in Hawaii*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1994.
- Taylor, Clarice B. *All About Hawaii: 1948-49*. Honolulu: Honolulu Star-Bulletin Publications Division, 1949.
- Twigg-Smith, Thurston. *Hawaiian Sovereignty: Do the Facts Matter?*. Honolulu: Goodale, 1998. 11 May 2003 <<http://www.hawaiimatters.com/facts.html>>.
- United States. Cong. Apology Bill Public Law 103-150. 23 Nov. 1993. Office of Hawaiian Affairs. 12 May 2003 <http://www.oha.org/apology_bill.html>.
- . Dept. of the Interior, and Dept. of Justice. *From Mauka to Makai: The River of Justice Must Flow Freely*. Rept. (2000). 3 May 2003 <<http://www.doi.gov/nativehawaiians/pdf/1023fin.pdf>>.

LIBRARY
OF
BIRMINGHAM-SOUTHERN
COLLEGE

